

Congress upon the statue of Sequoyah; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 651) authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the proposed raise in prices of farming implements by the International Harvester Co.; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging an appropriation for aid in the construction of public roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BRIGGS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, indorsing the Jones bill providing for the establishment of so-called central time in the western part of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, favoring the reduction in the supply of water in Lake Andes, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, favoring a reduction of the Army and Navy of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCARTHUR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, asking for the continuation of Federal aid to highways; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring emergency tariff legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring adjusted compensation for ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, favoring Federal aid for building roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, urging immediate legislation extending time of payment on entries in the Standing Rock Indian Reservation in North and South Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 15878) granting a pension to Priscilla J. Raisbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 15879) granting an increase of pension to Seph J. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 15880) granting a pension to Edgar F. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15881) granting an annuity to Henry M. Hutchinson; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15882) granting an annuity to Thomas F. King; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 15883) to authorize the President to reappoint J. P. D. Shiebler a major of Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 15884) granting a pension to Belle Kirgan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15885) granting a pension to Willie E. Persell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15886) granting a pension to Ora Agnes Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 15887) granting an increase of pension to Eliza F. Platt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 15888) granting a pension to Cynthia Rudler Osgood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 15889) granting a pension to Cynthia J. Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 15890) granting a pension to Isa Ann Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15891) granting a pension to Charlotte Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5217. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of New England Purchasing Agents' Association, concerning the decentralization plan of the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5218. Also (by request), petition of council of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, urging the extension of aid to the starving nations of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5219. By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the deportation of Mayor O'Callaghan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5220. By Mr. EDMONDS: Petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade, recommending early return to the general system of taxation followed by the Government prior to the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5221. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the passage of Senate bill 4594 (House bill 14461) as amended; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5222. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition signed by citizens of Chilton, Wis., protesting against giving away of any of the people's money loaned by our Government to other nations and asking that the payment of all interest be made by those nations promptly when due, in order to reduce the burden of taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5223. By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of 27 citizens of Newark, N. J., protesting against the occupation of Germany by French colonial troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5224. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of residents of Benzonia, Benzie County, Mich., urging enactment of so-called Sheppard-Towner maternity bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5225. Also, petition of residents of Benzonia, Benzie County, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 8063, to punish violation of the Volstead Liquor Act by United States citizens while in foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5226. By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of sundry citizens of Leominster, Mass., protesting against the occupation of Germany by French colonial troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5227. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of New England Purchasing Agents' Association, Boston, Mass., favoring the decentralized plan of the railroads which permits each system to regulate its own conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5228. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Susquehanna Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, No. 1812, in support of emergency tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5229. Also, petition of Susquehanna Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, No. 1812, opposing passage of a bill for daylight saving; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5230. Also, petition of Ambridge Board of Trade, of Ambridge, Pa., indorsing the American Legion program with respect to renewed help and assistance for disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5231. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Indiana Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, concerning the reapportionment of representation in the Southern States; to the Committee on Rules.

5232. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of women residents of Newton, Bucks County, Pa., favoring appropriations to enforce prohibition and for educational purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5233. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of H. L. Reads, State fire marshal of North Dakota, urging the passage of House bill 15327, making an appropriation for the prevention of forest fires; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5234. Also, petition of 77 citizens of New Salem, N. Dak., protesting against the occupation of Germany by French colonial troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 25, 1921.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., the Chaplain, offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, we recognize the hand that leads us and the blessings which are vouchsafed to us as from Thee. Grant us Thy care this day and all days. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, January 18, 1921, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### FINAL ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certificates of the governors of Kentucky, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, and Oklahoma

of the final ascertainment of electors for President and Vice President in their respective States at the election November 2, 1920, which were ordered to lie on the table.

CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year 1920, containing the actual figures for the year to be substituted for the report submitted on January 14, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LEASE OF DOCKS, PIERS, WAREHOUSES, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to Senate resolution 409, submitted by Mr. JONES of Washington, December 23, 1920, information as to what steps are being taken to lease any docks, piers, warehouses, or other facilities, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

T. A. GILLESPIE LOADING CO. (S. DOC. NO. 363).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$285,141.41, required to pay amounts found due on claims for damages to and loss of private property occasioned by the explosion and fire at the plant of the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co., at Morgan, N. J., October 4, 5, and 6, 1918, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RELIEF OF EMPLOYEE IN ASSISTANT TREASURER'S OFFICE, CHICAGO (S. DOC. NO. 362).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$315.44 required by the Treasury Department for the relief of John M. Rogers, an employee in the office of the Assistant Treasurer of the United States at Chicago, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WEEKLY ISSUE OF PATENTS (S. DOC. NO. 361).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$75,000 required by the Patent Office for printing the weekly issue of patents, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CHICKAMAUGA AND CHATTANOOGA NATIONAL PARK COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 360).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$8,000 required by the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Park Commission for the restoration of "Bond Bridge" in the park, fiscal year 1921, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of useless papers devoid of historic interest accumulated in the files of the Department of Commerce, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, to be selected by the Chair. The Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH of Montana and Mr. FRANCE members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and directed the Secretary of the Senate to notify the House of Representatives thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of useless papers devoid of historic interest accumulated in the files of the Department of the Treasury, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, to be selected by the Chair. The Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH of Montana and Mr.

FRANCE members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and directed the Secretary of the Senate to notify the House of Representatives thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, samples of "Industrial file" containing 10,000,000 cards which are now useless and devoid of historic interest, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, to be selected by the Chair. The Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH of Montana and Mr. FRANCE members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and directed the Secretary of the Senate to notify the House of Representatives thereof.

CREDENTIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certificate of the governor of Georgia, certifying to the election of THOMAS E. WATSON as a Senator from that State for the term of six years beginning March 4, 1921, which was read and ordered to be filed as follows:

STATE OF GEORGIA,  
Executive Department, Atlanta.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November, 1920, THOMAS E. WATSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Georgia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1921.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Atlanta this the 5th day of January, 1921.

[SEAL.]

By the governor:

HUGH M. DORSEY, Governor.

S. G. MCLENDON,  
Secretary of State.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Northwest Mushroom Growers' Association, of St. Paul, Minn., favoring a tariff upon mushrooms, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Hart & Murphy, of St. Paul, Minn., protesting against an increase in the tariff duty on wrapper tobacco, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota, favoring an appropriation to continue Federal aid to the several States in the construction of roads, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to appropriate money in aid of the construction of public roads.

Whereas the Congress of the United States has given great impetus to road building in the State of Minnesota and aided materially in financing the construction of State roads through the appropriation of Federal aid for that purpose; and

Whereas the State of Minnesota is depending upon the continuation of such Federal aid to assist it in carrying out its road-building program, and which program must be formulated and provided for by acts of the legislature of this State at its present session: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, requested to continue the Federal road aid to the several States, and that the amount of such Federal road aid for the next four years be in the amount of \$100,000,000 per year, to be apportioned and expended in accordance with the provisions of the present Federal road aid act; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, and to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

LOUIS L. COLLINS,  
Lieutenant Governor.

W. I. NOLAN,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 14th day of January, 1921.

GEO. W. PEACHEY,  
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house the 14th day of January, 1921.

OSCAR ARNESON,  
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

Approved January 18, 1921.

J. A. O. PREUS,  
Governor.

Filed January 19, 1921.

MIKE HOLM,  
Secretary of State.

I, Mike Holm, secretary of state of the State of Minnesota and keeper of the great seal, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the resolution filed in my office January 19, 1921.

[SEAL.]

MIKE HOLM,  
Secretary of State.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a resolution of Belle Point Lodge, No. 520, International Association of Machinists, of Fort Smith, Ark., opposing a reduction of the mechanical force of the Southern Pacific, Santa Fe, and other railroad corporations, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.



He also presented a petition of George T. Carnall et al., of Fort Smith, Ark., praying for the repeal of the tax on real-estate mortgages, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Harry E. Kelley, president of Kelley Trust Co., of Fort Smith, Ark., praying that an increased appropriation be made for the destruction of predatory animals, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota. I ask that it may be read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The concurrent resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
State of North Dakota.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, Thomas Hall, secretary of state of the State of North Dakota, do hereby certify that the following resolution was adopted by the seventeenth legislative assembly on the 17th day of January, 1921:

Dated at Bismarck, N. Dak., this 18th day of January, 1921.  
THOMAS HALL,  
Secretary of State.

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas crops in the vicinity of and on the Standing Rock Reservation, located in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota, have been practical failures during the past three years; and

Whereas, under and pursuant to the proclamation of the President of the United States, under date of March 13, 1915, approximately 2,500 settlers made entries upon the lands of said Standing Rock Reservation and have settled and made homes thereupon; and

Whereas, on account of aforesaid crop failures and losses sustained in stock raising, practically all of said entrymen are in default in their payments to the Government of the United States on account of said entries; and

Whereas no provision is made for the extension of time for the payment of said installments upon said entries in meritorious cases under the provisions of the act of Congress of February 14, 1913, as is disclosed by the Department of the Interior Circular No. 680; and Whereas, under and by virtue of a ruling of the Department of the Interior as disclosed by said Department of the Interior Circular No. 680, registers and receivers of the Federal land offices located at Bismarck, N. Dak., and Lemmon, S. Dak., have been instructed as follows:

"You are directed, therefore, in all cases where payments are now due and unpaid, and where payments hereafter become due and are not paid, to serve notice on the entrymen, of the defaults, and that in the event of their failure to make the payments in the time allowed by you for that purpose, you will report their entries to this office for cancellation.

"You will allow a period of 60 days from receipt of notice for the payment of sums now due and unpaid; but in all cases where payments hereafter become due and are not paid, you will require the payments to be made within a period of 30 days from receipt of notice."

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota assembled in regular session, That by virtue of the foregoing facts and circumstances great hardships and misfortunes will be and are being endured and suffered by such entrymen to the great detriment of the States of North and South Dakota, and the citizens thereof;

Therefore we respectfully urge the National Congress in session assembled to immediately consider and relieve this most deplorable condition by proper legislation; be it

Resolved further, That the secretary of state of the State of North Dakota be requested to forward copies of this concurrent resolution immediately upon its passage and approval to the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the National House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., and to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the National Congress from the States of North and South Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, bills covering the same subject were introduced some time ago, one in the House and the other by myself in the Senate, providing for the extension referred to. Both bills are pending before the Committee on Public Lands of the respective Houses. It is my information that there will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate to-morrow and that the bill will be ordered reported. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], of course, understands the necessity for prompt action in the matter if we are to have the relief.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from North Dakota that the Committee on Public Lands will meet to-morrow morning at 10:30, and I shall call the matter to the attention of the committee at that time.

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope that the Senator can get a report and immediate action on it. It is very important.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill has been referred to the department for a report. I can not state whether the report is before the committee, but I shall endeavor to ascertain to-day, and if not I shall ask for the report at once.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say that the report is before the committee, because I have a copy of it myself, and the original I sent to the committee.

Mr. McNARY presented a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relating to the Fordney emergency tariff bill, which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF OREGON,  
Office of the Secretary of State.

I, Sam A. Kozer, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 1 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 17, 1921, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 18th day of January, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

SAM A. KOZER,  
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 1.

Whereas this country is being flooded with foreign products which are destroying the home markets for the produce from the American farm, thereby causing financial disaster to overtake our farmers and stock raisers, and in this way destroy the very foundation of American prosperity: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to pass at the earliest possible moment the Fordney emergency tariff bill; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby further memorialized to enact a comprehensive tariff bill protecting American labor, American products, and American industry; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit by telegraph one copy of this resolution to each Senator and Representative in Congress from Oregon.

Adopted by the senate January 10, 1921.

ROY W. RITNER,  
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house January 13, 1921.

LOUIS E. BEAN,  
Speaker of the House.

Indorsed: Senate joint memorial No. 1. Introduced by Senator Dennis. John P. Hunt, chief clerk. Filed January 17, 1921. Sam A. Kozer, secretary of state.

Mr. McNARY presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Oregon, which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
STATE OF OREGON,  
Office of the Secretary of State.

I, Sam A. Kozer, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 2 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 17, 1921, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 18th day of January, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

SAM A. KOZER,  
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 2.

To the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that—

Whereas it has come to the attention of this body that there is before the Congress of the United States a measure known as the Fordney or fourfold adjustment compensation plan for ex-service men submitted by the American Legion; and

Whereas the purpose of this measure is to equalize the sacrifice of the American people in the World War so that the men who served in our Armies, Navy, and Marine Corps, and who were required to leave their home and employment in defense of the country, may be assisted in readjusting themselves to the economic and industrial life of the country; and

Whereas a decision by Congress has been delayed for nearly two years, creating a situation wherein the people of many States recognizing the validity, justice, and urgency of such compensation have been moved in their impatience at the failure of Congress to act to take upon themselves the partial payment of this obligation; and

Whereas this obligation is essentially and fundamentally a Federal obligation and which is long overdue; and

Whereas the House of Representatives of the United States have passed favorably upon this measure:

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, do respectfully and earnestly petition the Congress of the United States forthwith to act in concurrence with the House of Representatives to the end that this just claim of the men who served in the World War may be liquidated without further delay.

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Oregon be, and he is hereby, directed to forward a copy of this joint memorial under his certificate and seal to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Oregon in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the senate January 12, 1921.

ROY W. RITNER,  
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house January 12, 1921.

LOUIS E. BEAN,  
Speaker of the House.

Indorsed: House joint memorial No. 2. Introduced by Korell, Johnson, Hammond, Pierce, North, Wells, Marsh, and Leonard. W. F. Drager, chief clerk. Filed January 17, 1921. Sam A. Kozer, secretary of state.

Mr. McNARY presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Oregon, which was read and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the Record:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
STATE OF OREGON,  
Office of the Secretary of State.

I, Sam A. Kozer, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the house joint memorial No. 3 with the original thereof adopted by the senate and house of representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 17, 1921, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 18th day of January, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

SAM A. KOZER,  
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 3.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress of the United States of America:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in regular session convened, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the American Association of Highway Officials, in convention assembled at Louisville, Ky., in December, 1919, adopted a series of resolutions, copies of which were transmitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, in which resolutions there were, among other matters urged upon the attention and consideration of the Congress of the United States, the following facts:

That the States within whose boundaries are included large national forest reserves have expended during the last five years millions of dollars in the improvement of State and county highway systems; that the majority of these States have issued bonds in large amounts in order to finance modern highway construction; that there are within the boundaries of these States approximately 150,000,000 acres of national forest reserves; that State and county highways of national importance traverse these reservations through areas involving the most difficult highway construction in the West; that the forests in these various States are great national assets which should be preserved, and the construction of roads and highways traversing the said forests facilitates the control of forest fires, which have, in the past, caused tremendous losses; that the appropriations heretofore made by Congress have been inadequate to permit of sufficient road construction within such national forests to keep pace with State and county highway systems and construction, or to provide for a standard of construction equaling that of the several States and counties; that the withdrawal of large areas by the Government has decreased the taxable resources of the States and counties wherein such withdrawals have been made, thereby reducing the bonding capacity of said States and counties; that it is the duty of the National Government to provide sufficient funds to develop its national resources to the same extent and standards as that of the States and counties similarly situated; and

Whereas the facts and conditions heretofore stated apply with equal force, as emphasized by the American Association of Highway Officials, to Indian and other Federal reservations, and to unappropriated lands of the United States; and

Whereas the said Association of Highway Officials did, by said resolutions, urge upon the United States Congress, the appropriation of the sum of \$100,000,000 per year for a series of years, for the construction of rural post roads in the several States; and

Whereas the Public Land States Highway Association, in regular session convened in Washington, D. C., in February, 1920, unanimously indorsed the principles involved in the Louisville resolution; and

Whereas as a result of said conferences the Hon. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN, United States Senator from the State of Oregon, introduced a bill for the continuation of the Federal aid for the construction of rural post roads, and for the construction of roads and trails, within and partially within the forest reserves; and

Whereas at a subsequent annual meeting of the American Association of Highway Officials, in convention assembled in Washington, D. C., in December, 1920, said Association of Highway Officials, 47 States of the Union being represented, unanimously indorsed the principles involved in said bill introduced by Senator CHAMBERLAIN; and as a result of said convention, and the recommendations of said American Association of Highway Officials, the Hon. C. N. McARTHUR, of Oregon, introduced in the House of Representatives a bill embodying in substance that contained in the Chamberlain bill; and

Whereas said American Association of Highway Officials, after full consideration of the McArthur bill, unanimously indorsed the same; and

Whereas said legislation is now pending before the two branches of Congress; and

Whereas your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, unanimously indorse the Chamberlain-McArthur bill, and in support thereof respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States the further fact that the State of Oregon occupies a peculiar and special position, with reference to national forests and other national and Federal reserves, and therefore is in a peculiar and special need of adequate highway construction; and

Whereas the State of Oregon has expended during the past four years over \$27,000,000 in the construction of a permanent highway system in the State of Oregon; and

Whereas the State of Oregon has expended its full quota of Federal aid funds allotted to Oregon, and unless further extension of Federal aid in the construction of rural post roads, and the construction of forest roads and trails, is granted by this Congress, a serious breach in the highway program of the State of Oregon must necessarily follow: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in regular session convened, That we do hereby most respectfully urge and request that the Congress of the United States of America give special and immediate attention to the passage of the

Chamberlain-McArthur bill, and appropriate for highway construction the amounts designated in said bill, both for the construction of rural post roads in the several States and for the construction of forest roads and trails in the public land States, as designated in said bill, or so much thereof as can be justly and rightly appropriated this session of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Oregon be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this memorial, under the seal of his office, to each Member of the Oregon delegation in Congress and to the presiding officer of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Committee on Roads and Highways of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the United States Senate.

Adopted by the senate January 12, 1921.

ROY W. RITNER,  
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house January 12, 1921.

LOUIS E. BEAN,  
Speaker of the House.

Indorsed: House joint memorial No. 3. Introduced by Mr. Bean; W. F. Drager, chief clerk. Filed January 17, 1921. Sam A. Kozer, secretary of state.

Mr. SHEPPARD (for Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) presented three concurrent resolutions of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, which took the same course as the identical concurrent resolutions appearing above presented by Mr. McNARY.

Mr. WARREN presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Wyoming in relation to the so-called packers' bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
State of Wyoming, ss:

I, W. E. Chaplin, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of original house joint memorial No. 2, of the Sixteenth State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, has been carefully compared with the original on file in this office and that the same is a full, true, and correct transcript of said memorial and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 22d day of January, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

W. E. CHAPLIN,  
Secretary of State.

By H. M. LYMAN,  
Deputy.

House joint memorial 2.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring), That the Senate of the United States be memorialized as follows:

Whereas on January 24, 1921, 4 p. m., the Senate of the National Congress will by special order vote on the Gronna bill, which provides for the control of the packing and meat-producing industry through a live-stock commission clothed with power to make rules and regulations, said commission to be appointed by Federal Government: And therefore be it

Resolved, That we respectfully urge your honorable body that you give the said Gronna bill the most serious consideration, as it may relate to all of those industries which are directly affected by legislation which is aimed at the packing industry at a time when our business conditions are in a state of unparalleled disturbance and distress; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this joint memorial be sent to each of the Members of the Wyoming delegation in our National Congress and to the chairmen of the Senate and House committees which have this bill under consideration.

FRANK E. LUCAS,  
Vice President of the Senate.  
L. R. EWART,  
Speaker of the House.

Mr. KENDRICK presented an identical concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Wyoming, which took the same course as the resolution appearing above.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Sheridan Woman's Club, of Sheridan, Wyo., remonstrating against commercializing the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LENROOT presented a petition of Women of the War Veterans of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of a bonus bill for ex-service men, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HALE presented a memorial of the State Grange, of Maine, opposing a daylight saving law or a zone composed of certain Eastern States, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Maine State Grange, of Auburn, Me., favoring an embargo on all foreign shipments of potatoes for a period of one year, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ELKINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Richmond, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation restricting the immigration of aliens, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry members of the board of directors of the Young Women's Christian Association, of Wheeling, W. Va., favoring the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.



Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by Wasco Farm Center, of Wasco, Calif., favoring legislation to prohibit gambling in grain products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of Farmers' Union No. 225, of Bache, Okla., protesting against speculation in farm products, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of the Kansas-Oklahoma Fruit Jobbers' Association, of Wichita, Kans., favoring a duty on potatoes, onions, and lemons to be included in the emergency tariff bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the message of the President of May 25, 1920, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of State, regarding certain property in London as a residence for the American ambassador, etc., reported a bill (S. 4916) to acquire land and buildings in London, England, for the use of the diplomatic representative of the United States, which was read twice by its title, and submitted a report (No. 716) thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 4666) to amend section 13 of an act known as the Federal reserve act, approved December 23, 1913, reported it favorably with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 717) thereon.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 4897) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended, reported it favorably without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4719) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear and determine the claim of the owners of the Danish steamship *Flynderborg* against the United States, and for other purposes, reported it favorably with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 718) thereon.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1949) for the relief of George F. Reid, reported it favorably without amendment and submitted a report (No. 719) thereon.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13319) for the relief of Wilson Certain, reported it favorably without amendment and submitted a report (No. 720) thereon.

Mr. LENROOT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1299) for the relief of George LeClear, reported it favorably without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1300) for the relief of Alfred E. Lewis, reported it favorably without amendment.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15441) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 721) thereon.

#### ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF MISSOURI.

Mr. McLEAN. From the Committee on Banking and Currency I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 4893) to authorize the coinage of a 50-cent piece in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Missouri into the Union, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think I have any objection to the consideration of the bill, but such bills should first be read, and then we can determine the question.

Mr. BORAH. If there is going to be any discussion of the bill, I shall object. We have not had morning business for about 10 days, and we ought to get through with that. Does the Senator think there will be any discussion?

Mr. McLEAN. I do not think there will be any opposition to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 6, before the word "thousand," to strike out "five hundred" and insert "two hundred and fifty," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Missouri into the Union there shall be coined at the mints of the United States 50-cent pieces to the number of 250,000, such 50-cent pieces to be of the standard troy weight, composition, diameter, device, and design as shall be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, which said 50-cent pieces shall be legal tender in any payment to the amount of their face value.

Sec. 2. That all laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the process of coinage, providing for the purchase of material and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for security of the coin, or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for this coinage.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 4909) to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the Norwegian Government for the detention of three subjects of Norway in Hudson County, N. J.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 4910) to provide for the advertising for bids on purchases of supplies and contracts for labor and materials for the construction and repair of vessels under the United States Shipping Board or the United States Emergency Fleet Corporation; and

A bill (S. 4911) authorizing and directing examination and survey of the Hudson River channel along the Weehawken-Edgewater water front; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 4912) to authorize the appointment of an ordnance storekeeper in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 4913) to provide that engineer field clerks shall have the same military status and be subject to the same obligations and benefits as Army field clerks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico:

A bill (S. 4914) for the consolidation of forest lands in the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 4915) granting an increase of pension to Nellie A. Sanborn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 4917) to amend the income tax law, being Title II of the revenue act of 1918, by permitting the deduction from net income subject to tax of contributions made by corporations to organizations formed for certain enumerated purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 4918) granting a pension to William J. Swift; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### CHIEF OF MILITIA BUREAU.

Mr. CAPPER. I submit a resolution calling upon the Secretary of War for certain information in regard to the appointment of the Chief of the Militia Bureau, and I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the resolution be read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 432) was read, as follows:

Whereas section 81 of an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled, 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice," approved June 4, 1920, provides that, "The Chief of the Militia Bureau shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, by selection from lists of present and former National Guard officers, recommended by the governors of the several States and Territories as suitable for such appointment"; and Whereas in compliance with the provisions of this act the governors of 35 States recommended to the War Department the appointment of Charles I. Martin, Adjutant General of the State of Kansas, president of the Adjutant Generals' Association of the United States, and a veteran of the War with Spain and the World War, as Chief of the Militia Bureau; and

Whereas it is believed by a large number of National Guard organizations that the appointment of a Chief of the Militia Bureau made on December 29, 1920, ignores the recommendations of the governors of 35 of the 48 States duly filed with the War Department in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress, and is contrary to the spirit and purpose of Congress in enacting a law providing for such appointment: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to advise the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, as to the number, nature, and source of the recommendations filed in behalf of each officer considered in connection with the appointment of a Chief of the Militia Bureau, and present to the Senate all other information in the possession of the department having a bearing on this appointment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have no objection to the present consideration of the resolution if the Senator from Kansas desires it to be passed in the form in which he has presented it, but I desire to call attention to the fact that it calls on the Secretary of War for his reasons in making the appointment therein referred to. I doubt whether it is in line with a resolution of inquiry to call on the Secretary of War for his reasons in making a certain appointment. The Senator from Kansas is entitled to call on a department chief for facts and statements, but calling for his reasons for an appointment I think would give him good ground to decline to respond to the resolution. We have no right to demand a Cabinet officer's reasons for his action. I shall not object to the Senator's resolution, but I doubt whether it is in proper form.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have no objection to eliminating that part of the resolution, if the Senator from Alabama prefers that I shall do so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should prefer to have that part of the resolution stricken out. I think the Senator, however, is entitled to the facts for which his resolution asks.

Mr. CAPPER. That is what we want, and is really all we want.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not intend to object to the resolution, if the Senator desires it to pass as he has written it, but I would much prefer that the portion calling for the Secretary's reasons be stricken out, because, I repeat, I do not think we have any right in the Senate to call on a Cabinet officer for the reasons governing his action.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The resolution is somewhat long and contains several whereases. I think it should go over until to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

#### SUSPENSION OF NAVAL BUILDING PROGRAM.

Mr. BORAH. I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Idaho will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 433) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be, and is hereby, directed to report to the Senate whether in its opinion it is practical and also a sound policy to suspend our naval building program now in progress for the period of six months to the end that a full investigation and free discussion may be had as to what constitutes a modern fighting navy—a navy with the types of ships and with the air and submarine weapons that would be most effective in the strategy and tactics of future war on the sea; and also to the end that we may avail ourselves in the matter both as to economy and efficiency of any possible agreement between naval powers providing for the reduction of armaments.

Second. That said committee report to the Senate such data and information (not already printed and made public) as the said committee has had before it for consideration relative to the probable value of surface ships in future naval warfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho to state what is the purpose of the resolution and why he desires its immediate consideration.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the naval appropriation bill will be here shortly, I presume. I had intended to discuss the matter briefly, but I do not desire to do so in the morning hour. I will simply say that the resolution calls upon the Committee on Naval Affairs for information with reference to the feasibility and the wisdom of suspending the naval building program for six months. As the Senator perhaps knows, Great Britain has suspended her building program for six months for the purpose of ascertaining, if she may, the real revelations in the war with reference to what constitutes a modern navy.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, I realize the importance of the question. It is a problem that not only confronts this country but confronts all the world as to whether present plans for naval armaments shall be proceeded with. The Senator has directed his resolution of inquiry to a committee of the Senate. Of course, all of us have great respect for their conclusions,

where they have been deliberately worked out; but I do not know whether or not the Senator is informed if the committee to which the resolution is directed has developed such a study of the situation that they are prepared to make a report based on the facts and upon the consideration which they have given to the subject.

Mr. BORAH. What I desire to ascertain is whether or not the Committee on Naval Affairs has considered the question, and if so, what information it has in order that it may be laid before the Senate. If the report is satisfactory, I intend to follow this by a resolution directing an investigation of the entire question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, speaking for myself and as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, I hope the resolution will be adopted. I think the Naval Affairs Committee within a reasonably short time and during its consideration of the naval appropriation bill may obtain the information which, as I heard it read, the resolution calls for. It seems to me that now is an appropriate time for this Government to indicate to the world its purpose not to continue the burdens of military and naval armament. I hope that the Naval Affairs Committee, if this resolution shall be adopted, will make an adequate investigation to determine whether or not we may not suspend the naval program for the period indicated in the resolution, with a view ultimately to relieving the American people from the tremendous burden which is now bearing upon them.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is not present, but certainly I can see no objection to the adoption of the resolution of inquiry. It will require considerable time to make the proper investigation and present a satisfactory report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is agreed to.

#### SUPPLY OF COMMERCIAL FERTILIZER.

Mr. FLETCHER. I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. It calls for a report from the Department of Agriculture on the subject of fertilizers. We are having a great many complaints about the high cost of commercial fertilizers. The department made a report in 1916, in response to a resolution offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. That report is very instructive and valuable. In it the department stated that they were carrying on certain experiments and investigations in certain bureaus looking to a reduction in the cost of the elements entering into commercial fertilizer. The resolution introduced by me would bring that report down to date. I think it very important that we have the information.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 435) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to ascertain as nearly as possible, and to report to the Senate as soon as practicable, the following: The amount of commercial potash, nitrogen, and phosphoric acid available for fertilizer purposes, and the price of each of these articles as compared with the prices for 1913; and to furnish any suggestions as to relieving the situation in case the amount of any or all of these is insufficient or the price prohibitive, and to report what investigations were made and with what results, mentioned in Senate Document 262, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think that resolution ought to go over until to-morrow. It is rather broad in its scope, as I understand the language from hearing it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over.

#### APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I submit the resolution which I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I am inclined to think that a somewhat similar resolution, offered the other day, was misunderstood to some extent. The chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads made a motion to have it referred to that committee, I think with the idea that it called for a report from that committee on the nominations, and that it asked for the names of service men and ex-service men and widows of ex-service men. It did not ask for that. It simply called for information; that information to be furnished to the Senate and then subsequently disposed of by the Senate. This resolution relieves the committee entirely of that work and directs the information to be furnished to the Senate by the Postmaster General.

I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. Let us have it read.



The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 434) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Postmaster General be, and is hereby, directed to send to the Senate the names of all former service men, and the widows of such, recommended by him to the President for appointment as postmasters and by the President submitted to the Senate for confirmation and not as yet acted upon.

Mr. LODGE. In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I think the resolution had better go over. A resolution dealing with the same subject matter was objected to heretofore.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over.

#### CHANGES IN CUSTOMS SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 359).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

The sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, contains the following provisions, viz:

The President is authorized from time to time, as the exigencies of the service may require, to rearrange, by consolidation or otherwise, the several customs collection districts and to continue ports of entry by abolishing the same or establishing others in their stead: *Provided*, That the whole number of customs collection districts, ports of entry, or either of them, shall at no time be made to exceed those now established and authorized except as the same may hereafter be provided by law: *Provided further*, That hereafter the collector of customs of each customs collection district shall be officially designated by the number of the district for which he is appointed and not by the name of the port where the headquarters are situated, and the President is authorized from time to time to change the location of the headquarters in any customs collection district as the needs of the service may require: *And provided further*, That the President shall, at the beginning of each regular session, submit to Congress a statement of all acts, if any, done hereunder and the reasons therefor.

Pursuant to the requirements of the third proviso to the said provision, I have to state that the following changes in the organization of the Customs Service have been made by Executive order:

By Executive order dated February 2, 1920, customs collection district No. 27 (southern California) was abolished and customs collection districts Nos. 25 (San Diego) and 27 (Los Angeles) were created.

By Executive order dated February 27, 1920, the county of Alexandria, Va., including the port of Alexandria, was transferred from customs collection district No. 13 (Maryland) to customs collection district No. 14 (Virginia).

By Executive order dated March 6, 1920, the port of Cedar Keys, customs collection district No. 18 (Florida) was abolished.

By Executive order dated September 1, 1920, the port of Sulzer, customs collection district No. 31 (Alaska), was abolished and a port of entry was created at Craig in the same collection district.

All of the above changes were dictated by considerations of economy and efficiency in the administration of customs and other statutes with the enforcement of which the customs service is charged, as well as the necessities and convenience of commerce generally.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
25 January, 1921.

#### THE CALENDAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.). The morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4554, to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal power commission," and so forth.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, we should have the calendar considered. It is the experience of the Senate that we ought to have one day a week when we can consider bills as they are reached on the calendar. I object, and call for the regular order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4554.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the motion of the Senator from Washington is not in order, the bill not having been reached on the call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I did not know that it had been arranged that to-day should take the place of Monday. I did not understand that, or I would not have made the motion; so I withdraw it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was agreed, by unanimous consent, that to-day was to take the place of Calendar Monday.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was not aware of that, or I should not have made the request at all.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we begin at Order of Business 504. That is the place where the

Senate discontinued the consideration of the calendar on the last calendar day.

Mr. ASHURST. That is fair.

Mr. KING. May I inquire whether in the event of the completion of the calendar from that number before the expiration of the morning hour recurrence can be had to the first part of the calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Undoubtedly.

Mr. KING. I have no objection to the request of my colleague.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, the call of the calendar will begin with Order of Business 504.

The bill (S. 3318) for the relief of Willis B. Cross was announced as first in order on the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 515) to correct the military record of Charles K. Bond, alias Kimball W. Rollins, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 8038) to amend section 4 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, extending its provisions to Porto Rico, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McLEAN. I think that had better go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4076) to amend section 4404 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act approved July 2, 1918, providing that the supervising inspectors of the Steamboat-Inspection Service be included under the classified civil service, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I should like an explanation of that bill. I reserve the right to object to its consideration.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know whether the senior Senator from Utah objects to the consideration of that bill at this time or not.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, Mr. President; I object.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator objects. I knew that he had objected before.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2903) to provide that robbery of a Federal reserve bank or member bank shall constitute a felony, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 12266) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, as amended by the act of July 11, 1919, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. That bill can not be considered under the five-minute rule, and I therefore ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

W. T. DINGLER.

The bill (H. R. 974) for the relief of W. T. Dingler was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay \$60.63 to W. T. Dingler, the amount paid by him as bondsman for postmistress at Zebulon, Ark., to cover loss occasioned by the destroying of the post office by cyclone April 29, 1909.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

C. V. HINKLE.

The bill (H. R. 4184) for the relief of C. V. Hinkle was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to C. V. Hinkle, late clerk in post office, Conway, Ark., \$1,308.33 for salary for 29 months at the rate of \$1,000 per annum, the period during which he was dismissed from duty as said post-office clerk, upon charges preferred, which charges were found untrue, and by Executive order he was reinstated, it being found that the real culprit was not said Hinkle, but another person, who is now serving a Federal penitentiary term.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OSCAR SMITH.

The bill (H. R. 644) for the relief of Oscar Smith was announced as next in order.

The reading clerk read the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall be glad to hear the report of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], who has this bill in charge, as to whether there is any liability upon the part of the Government to make payment for the amount named in the bill.

Mr. SPENCER. The department were of the opinion that there was. The service was rendered, and the committee were of the opinion that the man was entitled to his compensation.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator if there was an obligation upon the part of the Government and the man rendered services, whether there is not some authority now by which the department could make compensation?

Mr. SPENCER. The committee found no such authority. The passage of this bill by the House was the reason for its approval by the Committee on Claims. There is quite an elaborate report on the bill, which I shall be glad to read to the Senator. It sets out the facts in the case somewhat at length, and the opinions of the departments are in it as well.

Mr. KING. I shall not ask the Senator to take the time of the Senate for that purpose. If the Senator can recall the facts and upon his recollection of them is of the opinion that this is a valid claim against the Government, I shall not object. If, upon the contrary, there is doubt in the Senator's mind with regard to that matter, I shall object to its consideration.

Mr. SPENCER. I can not say to the Senator that the facts in the case, which are somewhat extensive, are clear in my own mind.

Mr. KING. Then I ask that the bill go over, and I shall be glad to examine the report between now and the next calendar Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (H. R. 1789) for the relief of Thomas P. Darr was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1313) for the relief of Francis Nicholson was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### EXPORTATION OF SUGAR.

The bill (S. 4420) to prohibit the exportation of sugar, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] introduced and reported this bill. The last time the calendar was under consideration I made the statement that the bill ought to be indefinitely postponed, but that I would not make the motion until I had spoken to the Senator. Since that time I have called the Senator's attention to the bill, and he agrees that it shall be indefinitely postponed. Therefore I make that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

#### INTERFERENCE WITH COMMERCE.

The bill (S. 4204) to prohibit interference with commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who is greatly interested in this bill, is not here and wanted to be here when it was considered. I therefore ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### AWARD OF DECORATIONS.

The bill (S. 4432) to provide for awarding decorations, devices, or insignia to the next of kin of deceased persons who would have been entitled to receive the same, and making it unlawful for anyone other than the person authorized to do so to wear such decoration, device, or insignia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of some member of the Military Affairs Committee what is the reason of the provision found in the last lines of section 2, which reads as follows:

That honorable separation from the service of the United States of persons who would otherwise be entitled to receive them shall not prohibit or preclude the issuance to such persons of such decorations.

I would like to inquire whether or not the existing law prohibits the reception of such honors by persons who are not within the service and who would be entitled to such insignia, decorations, and so forth, if they were within the service; and if there is an existing law which prohibits it, is it the intention to repeal that law by this enactment? It would seem to me that if there is a law prohibiting the devices, decorations, and emblems from being distributed to those who have been separated from the service, there must have been some reason for such a statute, and if this is intended to repeal that statute, there ought to be some reasons assigned for such action. I should be very glad if some member of the Military Affairs Committee would offer some explanation in regard to that matter. I dislike very much to object to this bill, because I

am in entire sympathy with it, if I understand its terms; yet I do not quite understand why such a provision of law is necessary.

Mr. SMOOT. I object to its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### CLAIM OF WILLIAM H. H. HART.

The bill (S. 2665) for the relief of Prof. William H. H. Hart, principal of the Hart Farm School and Junior Republic for Dependent Children, to establish Hart University, and to provide for its maintenance and support, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 377) referring to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 2665) for the relief of Prof. William H. H. Hart, principal of the Hart Farm School and Junior Republic for Dependent Children, was announced as next in order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. May I ask the Senator from Utah a question? This resolution and the bill just passed over refer to the same matter?

Mr. SMOOT. They refer to the same matter, but I think that as this claim of Prof. Hart has been here so long it ought to go to the Court of Claims, so that court can decide as to whether he has any actual claim against the Government or not.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It occurred to me that as both refer to the same matter, one or the other of them ought to be indefinitely postponed and taken off the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. That will be done. The bill will be indefinitely postponed if the claim is referred to the Court of Claims. That is all there is to it. If the resolution is agreed to, I shall move immediately for the indefinite postponement of Senate bill 2665.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the consideration of Senate resolution 377?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let it be reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The reading clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 377) reported by Mr. SPENCER from the Committee on Claims, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the bill (S. 2665) for the relief of Prof. William H. H. Hart, principal of the Hart Farm School and Junior Republic for Dependent Children, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Before the resolution is disposed of, I would like to ask the Senator from Utah on what terms the claim is to go to the Court of Claims. Is the court to find a judgment, ascertain the facts, or what?

Mr. SMOOT. Under the resolution the court will ascertain the facts in the case. There is no requirement for a judgment, and Congress will have to make an appropriation to cover whatever the court may decide is due Prof. Hart. This is to determine the facts in the case.

Mr. FLETCHER. Will the action of the Senate adopting the resolution dispose of Senate bill 2665?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I have just stated that I would immediately move for the indefinite postponement of Senate bill 2665 if the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah, or the chairman, or some other member of the committee, whether the committee are satisfied that this is a valid claim?

Mr. SMOOT. I think there is an amount really due Prof. Hart. I would like to have the Court of Claims ascertain the amount. I do not know whether the Senator has ever read the long hearings which have been held before the Appropriations Committees for several years in regard to the burning of Prof. Hart's school; but I have gone through the testimony carefully, and I have concluded, as I think any other Senator will who will read it, that Prof. Hart has a valid claim, and I just want it to go to the Court of Claims that the court may ascertain the amount.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the bill (S. 2665) for the relief of Prof. William H. H. Hart, principal of the Hart Farm School and Junior Republic for Dependent Children, to establish Hart University, and to provide for its maintenance and support, be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

#### SUPERINTENDENT OF WEIGHTS, MEASURES, AND MARKETS.

The bill (H. R. 8067) to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the superintendent of weights, measures, and markets of the



District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### BOULEVARD ON MISSIONARY RIDGE.

The bill (H. R. 12502) providing for a report on the cost of improving and maintaining the Government boulevard on Missionary Ridge, in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no report accompanying the bill, and I would like to have the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] give an explanation of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a full explanation given in the bill itself. It states the facts concerning this road.

Mr. SMOOT. Then let it be read.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will permit it to be read, because that is the best way to get a statement of the facts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That for the purpose of ascertaining the cost of improvement and maintaining in proper condition for travel the Government boulevard on Missionary Ridge, in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, from the north end of said road, near East Chattanooga, in Hamilton County, Tenn., to Rossville, in Walker County, Ga. (a distance of 7 or 8 miles), the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause an examination of said road to be made, and a report to be made by the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park Commission of the approximate cost of such improvement and the manner in which it can be and should be done. The said commission shall report estimates of the cost of said improvement by concrete surface, and other proper methods. The cost of concrete surface, gutters, excavations, and fills wherever necessary shall be reported, and the cost of graveling excavations and fills, if that method shall be deemed best; and the maintenance of such road, per annum, by oiling and other means, shall also be reported.

No material change shall be made in the line of the road as now established, nor shall the cost of any excavations or fills be considered except where it may be absolutely necessary for a first-class boulevard; but estimates for the cost of widening the road wherever it shall be necessary shall be made.

It shall also report what the cost of concreting the road in its present condition, without additional fills or excavations, will be; and the cost of graveling and maintenance per annum would be, including oiling and the difference between the cost and maintenance of a concrete road per annum and the gravelled and oiled road.

The commission shall report to the Secretary of War, as herein provided, within four months from the passage of this act, and the Secretary of War shall transmit this report to Congress with his recommendations in the premises.

The cost of such examination and report shall not exceed \$1,000, and so much of said sum as is necessary to make such examination and report is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. SMOOT. Why does the Senator ask for an appropriation to carry out this work? Can it not be done under the general appropriations which are made?

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand not. It is a House bill, and I understand that it will require a small appropriation to carry out what is provided in the bill. If the Senator feels that the amount provided is too much and wants it made \$500, I should think the work could be done for \$500.

Mr. SMOOT. It seems to me that \$500 would be ample.

Mr. McKELLAR. The only trouble about it is that it is now so late in the session that if we amended the bill it would be difficult to have it become a law. I hope the Senator will let it pass without amendment, because it is a matter which ought to be attended to, and it ought to be attended to at once.

Mr. SMOOT. Is this survey and examination to be made upon Government-owned lands entirely?

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that the road is largely through the park and goes out a short distance to the fort. The Government owns and controls it. It is Government property.

Mr. SMOOT. The Government owns the whole of it?

Mr. McKELLAR. It owns the whole of it, I understand.

Mr. SMOOT. I move to strike out "\$1,000" and insert "\$500."

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not offer that amendment, because it will be difficult to get the bill through at this session unless we agree to it as it is.

Mr. SMOOT. There will be plenty of time for a conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 3, line 2, strike out "\$1,000" and in lieu insert "\$500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 4357) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, Army and Navy nurses (male and female), and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 380) referring to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 2673) for the relief of James L. Vai was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3483) for the relief of George T. Hamilton was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over.

The bill (S. 4057) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to remove the charge of desertion under certain conditions from the records of former members of the naval service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4322) for the relief of Philip A. Hertz was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### ESTATES OF I. G. WICKERSHAM AND OTHERS.

The bill (S. 4501) for the relief of certain estates was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the personal or legal representative of the estate of I. G. Wickersham, late of California, the sum of \$4,884.51; to the estate of George W. Clayton, late of Colorado, the sum of \$710.01; to the estate of Samuel H. Galpin, the sum of \$187.31; to the estate of William I. Townsend, the sum of \$3,780.27—all late of Connecticut; to the estate of Amanda S. Cook, the sum of \$997.95; to the estate of Everett E. Dutton, the sum of \$222.66; to the estate of George W. Hoffman, the sum of \$1,096.20; to the estate of Theodore Lattin, the sum of \$205.90; to the estate of Abner M. Lewis, the sum of \$303.30; to the estate of Aaron H. McClurg, the sum of \$142.50; to the estate of William J. McDowell, the sum of \$92.96; to the estate of Francis E. Rigby, the sum of \$715.14; to the estate of William H. Salisbury, the sum of \$350.43; to the estate of Francis T. Wheeler, the sum of \$5,427.34—all late of Illinois; to the estate of Helen P. Carson, the sum of \$166.73; to the estate of Elizabeth Campbell, the sum of \$365.62—all late of Indiana; to the estate of Booth F. Glover, the sum of \$557.19; to the estate of U. Marinoni, the sum of \$1,011.71—all late of Louisiana; to the estate of Mary C. Carson, the sum of \$142.06; to the estate of Henry W. Kingsbury, the sum of \$300.88; to the estate of William Renshaw, the sum of \$353.52—all late of Maryland; to the estate of Clara A. H. Adams, the sum of \$238.37; to the estate of Charles W. S. Adams, the sum of \$184.31; to the estate of John K. P. Balch, the sum of \$413.13; to the estate of Robert Bartlett, the sum of \$110.57; to the estate of Julia A. Beal, the sum of \$148.50; to the estate of Lyman Brooks, the sum of \$118.56; to the estate of John W. Corey, the sum of \$181.82; to the estate of Harriet B. Chapman, the sum of \$385.40; to the estate of Susan Emily Cunningham, the sum of \$382.54; to the estate of Nancy M. Downer, the sum of \$3,811.74; to the estate of William G. Doe, the sum of \$646.65; to the estate of Chauncey G. Fuller, the sum of \$208.40; to the estate of Mary E. Fletcher, the sum of \$118.74; to the estate of Elizabeth J. Greeley, the sum of \$118.20; to the estate of Pauline Gerry, the sum of \$943.53; to the estate of Mary H. Grosvenor, the sum of \$163.42; to the estate of Frederick A. Gilbert, the sum of \$355.26; to the estate of David N. Holway, the sum of \$132.68; to the estate of Elizabeth F. Harvey, the sum of \$1,011.90; to the estate of Susan B. Lyman, the sum of \$2,578.96; to the estate of Elizabeth P. Loring, the sum of \$1,895.55; to the estate of Mary S. Moore, the sum of \$77.34; to the estate of Esther S. B. Pettie, the sum of \$185.81; to the estate of Eliza A. Paine, the sum of \$1,247.61; to the estate of Charles H. Pinkham, the sum of \$1,014.66; to the estate of George A. Sammet, the sum of \$374.30; to the estate of George Shorey, the sum of \$583.58; to the estate of Mary E. Stearns, the sum of \$891.14; to the estate of Adeline G. Seccomb, the sum of \$128.60; to the estate of Cecelia Tully, the sum of \$114.01; to the estate of Gilman J. Wright, the sum of \$159.75; to the estate of Francis W. Wright, the sum of \$189.94; to the estate of Francis W. Wood, the sum of \$306.24; to the estate of Mary Davis Denny, the sum of \$118.53; to the estate of James F. Stevens, the sum of \$273.40—all late of Massachusetts; to the estate of Jay A. Hubbell, the sum of \$1,236.44, late of Michigan; to the estate of Eliza C. Gardner, the sum of \$633.42; to the estate of Frederick Heman, the sum of \$334.18; to the estate of William Koken, the sum of \$900.01; to the estate of Thomas M. Page, the sum of \$1,894.80; to the estate of Charles E. Pearce, the sum of \$2,994.94; to the estate of Eliza R. Paschall, the sum of \$836.36; to the estate of Thomas Rankin, Jr., the sum of \$716.65; to the estate of William Senter, the sum of \$1,689.21; to the estate of Edward Walsh, the sum of \$1,100.99; to the estate of Catherine D. Wainwright, the sum of \$15,176.80—all late of Missouri; to the estate of John E. Caffrey, the sum of \$426.36; to the estate of Peter C. Diehl, the sum of \$667.47; to the estate of Hope Z. Deacon, the sum of \$798.58; to the estate of Walter Ferrier, the sum of \$437.12; to the estate of Garret A. Hooper, the sum of \$558.64; to the estate of Frederic Wood, the sum of \$924—all late of New Jersey; to the estate of Serena P. Appleton, the sum of \$387.15; to the estate of William H. Appleton, the sum of \$2,589.34; to the estate of Theodore M. Barnes, the sum of \$303.88; to the estate of Alice A. Bacon, the sum of \$133.19; to the estate of Sophia E. Beach, the sum of \$645.88; to the estate of Catharine Bolken, the sum of \$113.29; to the estate of Thomas H. Barowsky, the sum of \$845.69; to the estate of Frank A. Burnham, the sum of \$91.62; to the estate of Alex. Gordon Bradley, the sum of \$509.83; to the estate of Julius P. Child, the sum of \$172.02; to the estate of James A. Christie, the sum

of \$564; to the estate of Lucretia G. Clowes, the sum of \$4,249.35; to the estate of James Devlin, the sum of \$179.63; to the estate of Miln N. Dayton, the sum of \$242.23; to the estate of Cornelia B. De Peyster, the sum of \$172.41; to the estate of William G. Evans, the sum of \$465.06; to the estate of Benjamin T. Frothingham, the sum of \$3,338.92; to the estate of Virginia D. Furman, the sum of \$515.22; to the estate of Thomas Fenton, the sum of \$997.75; to the estate of Thomas Gould, the sum of \$695.12; to the estate of William H. Gelschen, the sum of \$2,325.57; to the estate of Margaret Hilliard, the sum of \$598.56; to the estate of Mary Ann Hayes, the sum of \$605.22; to the estate of Pierre Humbert, the sum of \$2,815.08; to the estate of Emma F. Hall, the sum of \$234.96; to the estate of Mary Hanstein, the sum of \$171.42; to the estate of Philip J. Holzderber, the sum of \$270.36; to the estate of J. Lee Judson, the sum of \$2,681.76; to the estate of Sarah M. Knight, the sum of \$454.02; to the estate of Edward Kelly, the sum of \$1,805.94; to the estate of Mary Ann Kissam, the sum of \$668.30; to the estate of Daniel D. Lake, the sum of \$282.86; to the estate of J. Nelson Low, the sum of \$83.68; to the estate of Phoebe A. Lowerre, the sum of \$98.38; to the estate of John McCullough, the sum of \$121.72; to the estate of John McDermott, the sum of \$292.66; to the estate of Morris Mark, the sum of \$1,847.26; to the estate of John H. Moss, the sum of \$734.88; to the estate of Jane D. Marks, the sum of \$612.13; to the estate of Michael Murphy, the sum of \$2,640.90; to the estate of Courtlandt D. Moss, the sum of \$1,061.10; to the estate of Alfred Ray, the sum of \$4,508.89; to the estate of Agnes H. Robinson, the sum of \$525.68; to the estate of James Robley, the sum of \$383.84; to the estate of William M. Rice, the sum of \$2,690.27; to the estate of Mary R. Swan, the sum of \$4,204.15; to the estate of Helene Sommerhoff, the sum of \$1,022.63; to the estate of Julia Stansbury, the sum of \$584.29; to the estate of John R. Thomas, the sum of \$1,697.73; to the estate of Julia K. Thomas, the sum of \$102.03; to the estate of Sarah A. Townsend, the sum of \$1,951.12; to the estate of Sarah A. Thomson, the sum of \$331.90; to the estate of Charles Unger, the sum of \$7,655.58; to the estate of Daniel E. Wyand, the sum of \$106.02; to the estate of Sarah M. Weston, the sum of \$2,929.53; to the estate of William Sanford Weeks, the sum of \$161.12; to the estate of Nicolaus Will, the sum of \$310.36—all late of New York; to the estate of Charles Baker, the sum of \$1,118.81; to the estate of Emerine Baldwin, the sum of \$1,070; to the estate of John W. Moore, the sum of \$380.55; to the estate of James M. Smith, the sum of \$532.56—all late of Ohio; to the estate of Charles Caleb Cresson, the sum of \$1,139.45; to the estate of James S. Cox, the sum of \$959.34; to the estate of Franklin B. Eisen, the sum of \$965.58; to the estate of George W. Farr, the sum of \$527.86; to the estate of Morton P. Henry, the sum of \$1,766.15; to the estate of David Hey, the sum of \$185.98; to the estate of Griffith Morgan Hopkins, the sum of \$2,600.83; to the estate of Annie Henderson, the sum of \$172; to the estate of Susan W. Longstreth, the sum of \$105.49; to the estate of William M. Levering, the sum of \$357.96; to the estate of Josiah Miller, the sum of \$515.32; to the estate of Stephen P. M. Tasker, the sum of \$883.35; to the estate of Josephine S. White, the sum of \$282.93—all late of Pennsylvania; and to the estate of John Scowcraft, late of Utah, the sum of \$603.93, or so much thereof as may be due under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States (see *United States v. Jones*, and *McCoach v. Pratt*, reported in 236 U. S. Rep., decided in January, 1915).

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (H. R. 1856) for the relief of Arthur J. Burdick was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 9794) for the relief of Wendell Phillips Lodge, No. 365, Knights of Pythias, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no report accompanying the bill. I ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7567) for the relief of G. T. and W. B. Hastings, partners trading as Hastings Bros., was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4005) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Fore River Shipbuilding Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### REUBEN R. HUNTER.

The bill (S. 676) for the relief of Reuben R. Hunter was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I hope there will be no objection to the consideration of the bill. It is a very meritorious matter. It has been fully considered by the committee having the bill in charge, and I feel sure it would be regarded as a meritorious bill by Senators if they understood it.

Mr. KING. I will withhold objection while the Senator may make an explanation of it.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The case is a simple one. In 1916 there was a forest fire in New Mexico, and Mr. Hunter, with others, volunteered to help fight that fire. In doing so he suffered such injuries that he became totally blind. The bill simply makes provision for him to come within the terms of the compensation act of 1916, the same as though he were an employee of the United States. The young man is totally blind,

totally dependent, and the bill gives him the right of a Federal employee in that respect. I hope that the bill may be passed.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether he has considered the wisdom and propriety of putting into the compensation class individuals who are not employees of the Government? Would it not be better to make a direct appropriation rather than assign to such persons a class or status which they do not enjoy?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will say to the Senator that the bill as originally prepared by me provided for a lump-sum appropriation, but the Committee on Claims, which had the matter in hand, decided that it would be better to deal with it in this way. So the bill as amended is really the bill of the Committee on Claims. They considered the matter at great length. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], and other members of the committee gave very careful consideration to the bill and suggested this manner of dealing with the matter.

I see no reason in the world why the young man should not have the status of an employee serving the Government of the United States at the time of a desperate emergency, aiding in saving a very large amount, in value, of property of the United States. The committee has given the matter full consideration, and, being a unanimous report of the committee, I trust there will be no objection to the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. This is virtually a pension for life. There is no telling what it will cost. It provides for the payment of \$66.67 per month. We have had men fight for our country and receive as great injuries who do not receive so much per month. There ought to be some rule applied in these cases.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If the Senator will permit me, the bill merely proposes to comply with the rule which has been already established in the case of Federal employees. This is a case of total blindness. If the individual had been an employee of the United States, he would have been entitled under existing law to precisely this amount of compensation. It is in order to conform with that law and put him in the same status as an employee that the bill is proposed to be amended by the committee. I think that the bill as amended by the committee complies with the suggestion which the Senator from Utah has just made.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not looked it up, and I do not know whether the amount is correct or not.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The report of the committee contains a statement from the department upon the subject. The department suggested the amount, in order to make it conform to what the beneficiary would have received had he been in the employ of the United States. That is all in the report of the committee. At the end of the report of the committee the Senator will find the statement from an official of the department.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Utah that the department stated that the maximum compensation provided for employees of the United States is \$66.67 a month and suggested that the bill be changed so as to allow Mr. Hunter compensation in the sum of \$66.67, which is the provision of the amended bill. There can be no doubt that if the man had been in the employ of the Government he would have been entitled to this amount under the compensation law of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no such suggestion here. Mrs. Axtell, of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission says:

Senator HENDERSON's amendment appears to be in proper form to permit the commission to compensate Mr. Hunter in the manner outlined by the act of September 7, 1916. The maximum compensation provided for employees of the United States, however, is \$66.67 a month, whereas it would seem that the amendment contemplates that Mr. Hunter shall receive \$100 a month. I would suggest that the amended bill be changed to allow Mr. Hunter compensation in the sum of \$66.67 a month, which is the maximum allowed under the provision of section 6 of the compensation act. I would also suggest that the provisions of the compensation act might be extended to Mr. Hunter to take effect from September 7, 1916, the date of the passage of the act.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The committee advised that compensation should be fixed at the rate of \$100 a month. The department suggested that it ought to be reduced to the compensation allowed under the act.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I inquire of the Senator from New Mexico whether the injury occurred while the party was actually doing work for the Government?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is quite true, I may say to the Senator. He, together with other parties in the vicinity where the forest fire was raging, volunteered their services and went into the forest reserve and engaged in putting out a very large forest fire. In doing that he suffered injury to his eyes which resulted in total blindness. He has no means of support,



and, of course, is dependent upon others, as anyone would be who is totally blind. He is a young man about 22 or 23 years of age and through his whole future must suffer in that condition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose since we are going to enter upon the policy of having individuals outside of the Government service pensioned by the Government, this is just as good a way as any. Perhaps I had better not object to it.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to award and pay to Reuben R. Hunter, of Deming, N. Mex., who suffered a total and permanent loss of sight in both eyes as a result of voluntarily fighting a forest fire on Government land in the vicinity of Clondcroft, Otero County, N. Mex., in May, 1904, in an effort to protect valuable standing timber and other property of the United States, compensation at the rate of \$66.67 per month, from September 7, 1916, for the period and in the manner provided by the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, for the payment of compensation for permanent disability of a civil employee resulting from personal injury sustained while engaged in the performance of his duty.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AWARD OF DECORATIONS.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to recur to Senate bill 4432, which came up on the calendar during my temporary absence and was objected to. The bill was introduced by me.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think we had better proceed with the calendar in regular order and get through with it before returning to bills which have been objected to.

Mr. PHELAN. I submit that 2 o'clock may arrive before the regular call is completed.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the bill may be called up later.

Mr. KING. I join in the request of the Senator from California. The bill went over on my objection, but since talking with the Senator from California I think it is a measure which ought to be passed. It is a bill granting decorations and insignia to the next of kin of certain persons upon whom they were originally bestowed and who have since died.

Mr. PHELAN. It is Order of Business 592 on the calendar, and I trust the senior Senator from Utah will yield for its consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the consideration of the bill referred to; but I am going to object to the consideration of any other bills out of order. I should like to go on with the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill named by the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN]? The bill has been read.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4432) to provide for awarding decorations, devices, or insignia to the next of kin of deceased persons who would have been entitled to receive the same, and making it unlawful for anyone other than the person authorized to do so to wear such decoration, device, or insignia, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That whenever under the laws of the United States or under any rules and regulations of the War or Navy Departments made in conformity therewith any decoration, cross, medal, clasp, button, badge, ribbon, star, or other emblem, device, or insignia has been, or shall hereafter be, awarded to any person by reason of any act, deed, conduct, or service in, or in connection with, any war, campaign, or expedition in which the United States has engaged or shall hereafter engage, and such person shall have died prior to receiving the same, said decoration, device, or insignia shall be delivered to such of the next of kin of the deceased person or to his widow, as the President may prescribe, and upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe, and if such person has died or shall hereafter die prior to the award to which he would otherwise have been entitled such award may be posthumously made, in the discretion of the President, and such decoration, device, or insignia delivered to such next of kin, or to his widow, upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe.

Sec. 2. That honorable separation from the service of the United States of persons who would otherwise be entitled to receive them shall not prohibit or preclude the issuance to such persons of such decorations, devices, emblems, or insignia as may have been or as may hereafter be authorized, allowed, or ordered to be awarded, issued, or bestowed upon persons in the service of the United States; and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized, after the proper award thereof is made, to issue such decoration, device, emblem, or insignia to the former personnel of their respective departments so entitled thereto, regardless of their previous separation from the service of the United States: *Provided*, That such decorations, em-

blems, devices, or insignia will hereafter be issued without charge to officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men entitled thereto.

Sec. 3. That it shall be unlawful for any person to wear or to display upon his or her person within the United States or any other place subject to its jurisdiction with intent to deceive or mislead, any decoration, cross, medal, bar, clasp, button, star, ribbon, badge, stripe, or other emblem, insignia, or device heretofore or hereafter authorized, conferred, issued, or authorized to be worn under the laws of the United States, or under any rules and regulations of the War or Navy Departments made in conformity with the laws of the United States, by reason of, or to indicate heroic, distinguished, or meritorious acts, deeds, or conduct in the service of the United States, or honorable participation in the service of the United States in any war, campaign, or expedition in which the United States has been, or is, or shall be, a party, except the person upon account of whose acts, deeds, conduct, participation in, or connection with, such war, such emblem, insignia, or device was awarded, bestowed, or issued, or such other person as may be authorized by law or the order pursuant to which the same was awarded, bestowed, or issued to wear the same. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall upon conviction be punished by a fine not exceeding \$300 or imprisonment for not exceeding 90 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Sec. 4. That no print, cut, or pictorial representation of any medal, cross, clasp, button, badge, ribbon, emblem, or other decoration or award to any person by reason of any act, deed, conduct, or service in, or in connection with any war in which the United States has participated or may hereafter participate shall be used, published, printed, or exhibited on, or in connection with, an advertisement by any firm, company, or corporation for any purpose other than such as may be authorized by the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BUSINESS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 4372) to encourage the establishment of farms and suburban homes by veterans of the World War was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

The next business on the calendar was the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 203) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to turn over to the county commissioners of Dickinson County, Kans., suitable pontoon equipment for temporary use across the Smoky Hill River at Chapman, Kans.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the joint resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

#### NATIONAL BUDGET SYSTEM.

The bill (H. R. 14441) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire to ask my colleague whether this is the bill which finally came from conference and was passed by the other House?

Mr. SMOOT. The bill was passed by the other House, I will say to the Senator from Utah, in order to conform to the objection which was made to the original budget bill by the President. There are a number of Senators who desire when the bill comes up for consideration to be present. I know there are many Senators who feel that the bill as it was originally reported and passed the other House and first came to the Senate ought now to be insisted upon when the subject is considered by the Senate.

Mr. KING. I expressed the view some time ago that we ought to pass the bill over the President's veto, because I do not believe that the objection urged by the President was grounded upon a proper interpretation of the Constitution of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being objection, the bill will be passed over.

#### WATER-POWER PROJECTS WITHIN NATIONAL PARKS.

The bill (S. 4554) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that bill go over.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I wish to inquire if objection was made to the present consideration of Senate bill 4554?

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] if this is the measure to which he referred?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. KING. Then I have no objection to the consideration of the bill, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That hereafter no permit, license, lease, or authorization for dams, conduits, reservoirs, power houses, transmission lines, or other works for storage or carriage of water, or for the development, transmission, or utilization of power, within the limits of any national park or national monument shall be granted or made without specific authority of Congress, and so much of the act of Congress approved June 10, 1920, entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920, as authorizes licensing such uses of national parks and national monuments by the Federal Power Commission is hereby repealed.

Mr. BORAH. That bill can not be disposed of this morning. The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the Senator from Idaho may object to its consideration.

Mr. BORAH. I object to its consideration.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in connection with the bill which has just been read. I was not able distinctly to hear the reading of the bill, but I understand that it was introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] for the purpose of eliminating national parks from the jurisdiction of the Water Power Commission.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think, perhaps, it would be appropriate to say in this connection that the Senator from Washington, as well as myself, is under obligation to bring this matter to the consideration of the Senate with all speed, and unless there is some special reason I hope the measure will have consideration.

When the water power bill was transmitted to the Senate for consideration an objection was made—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to object to the remarks of the Senator from Montana, but I understand the bill is not under consideration. There was objection to the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I so understand; but I will take occasion at this time to say what I desire to say, with the permission of the Senate.

An objection was made to the bill by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Payne, upon the ground that it granted the water-power commission created by that act the authority to authorize the construction of dams for power purposes within the national parks, and it seemed not unlikely that the bill would be vetoed by the President in consequence of the objection to it thus pointed out by the Secretary of the Interior. In that connection the Senator from Washington and myself, both being very deeply interested in the speedy enactment of the measure, called upon the Secretary of the Interior and stated to him that if he would withdraw his objection to the bill we would at the ensuing session of Congress charge ourselves with the duty of introducing a bill to relieve the water-power measure of the objection and urge its passage upon the Senate. Accordingly, I feel obligated to do what I can to remove any objection that might be made against the bill. I feel that both of us stand pledged to do everything we can to expedite the passage of the bill.

In this connection I also desire to say, Mr. President, that in all of the long discussion of and consideration given to the water-power bill I do not recall that anybody ever called attention to the feature of that bill to which reference is now made. It was embodied in the bill as it was originally prepared by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture. It was not the subject of discussion upon the floor. Apparently it passed without any attention whatever being given to it. No one was particularly interested in it, so far as I can understand; yet, notwithstanding this condition of affairs, and the pledge given by the Senator from Washington as well as myself, a very active, energetic campaign is being waged, and the country is being deluged with appeals from civic associations of all kinds charging something in the nature of intrigue or indirection in getting this provision into the water-power bill and calling on all the friends of the national parks throughout the country to assist in sweeping away all possible objection to the legislation now proposed and speedily accomplishing its enactment, reminding one of some of the adventures of Don Quixote and his celebrated mount. I do not believe that there is any serious objection to the enactment of this measure. I hope that we shall have it speedily considered. I say this in explanation of my own attitude with respect to it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am not going to stand in the way of the consideration of the bill if it comes up on a proper occasion when we can consider it for a reasonable length of time, but I do object to it at the present time. It is a matter of some importance, and we could not possibly dispose of it under the rules with the time which we have this morning.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will simply say that this is the first time I ever heard of any objection to the bill. It has

been reported unanimously by the Committee on Commerce, I believe, and I never knew heretofore there were any objections to it.

Mr. BORAH. There are some objections to it, Mr. President, which have been presented to me. What my final attitude upon the bill will be I do not know, but it is a matter of a great deal of importance to some people. I therefore do not desire that the Senate shall undertake to dispose of it this morning.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have been seeking to get this bill up for some time. I knew that the Senator from Idaho was interested in it, and possibly might have some objection to it. I have delayed asking for its consideration in order that the Senator from Idaho might procure some information concerning the bill which he desired to obtain. As I have said before, at the very first opportunity I expect to call the bill up. As the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has stated, I feel under obligation to do whatever may be possible to secure action upon the measure by the Senate, and I expect to secure such action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### COPPER RIVER & NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY CO.

The bill (S. 551) for the relief of the Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co. was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Nevada, \$3,102.92, in refund of the gross income tax paid by that company to the collector of internal revenue at Tacoma, Wash., on May 21, 1915, pursuant to a tax levied under the act of Congress approved July 18, 1914 (38 Stat., p. 517), for the period beginning January 1 and ending June 30, 1914, for which period the company had previously paid the license fee or tax provided by the act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat., pp. 1336, 1337), as amended by the act approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat., pp. 330, 331).

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CIVIL GOVERNMENT OF PORTO RICO.

The bill (H. R. 11769) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That paragraph 19 of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That no public money or property shall ever be appropriated, applied, donated, used, directly or indirectly, for the use, benefit, or support of any sect, church, denomination, sectarian institution, or association, or system of religion, or for the use, benefit, or support of any priest, preacher, minister, or other religious teacher or dignitary as such. Contracting of polygamous or plural marriages hereafter is prohibited."

Sec. 2. That section 3 of said act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. That no export duties shall be levied or collected on exports from Porto Rico, but taxes and assessments on property, internal revenue, and license fees, and royalties for franchises, privileges, and concessions may be imposed for the purposes of the insular and municipal governments, respectively, as may be provided and defined by the Legislature of Porto Rico; and, when necessary to anticipate taxes and revenues, bonds and other obligations may be issued by Porto Rico or any municipal government therein as may be provided by law, and to protect the public credit: *Provided, however,* That no public indebtedness of Porto Rico or of any subdivision or municipality thereof shall be authorized or allowed in excess of 10 per cent of the aggregate tax valuation of its property, and all bonds issued by the government of Porto Rico, or by its authority, shall be exempt from taxation by the Government of the United States or by the government of Porto Rico or of any political or municipal subdivision thereof, or by any State, or by any county, municipality, or other municipal subdivision of any State or Territory of the United States, or by the District of Columbia. In computing the indebtedness of the people of Porto Rico, bonds issued by the people of Porto Rico secured by an equivalent amount of bonds of municipal corporations or school boards of Porto Rico shall not be counted."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] the purpose of the bill and wherein it changes existing law?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it changes existing law in two particulars. The act "to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," which was approved March 2, 1917, contained this provision:

"That no public money or property shall ever be appropriated, applied, donated, used, directly or indirectly, for the use, benefit, or support of any sect, church, denomination, sectarian institution, or association, or system of religion, or for the use, benefit, or support of any priest, preacher, minister, or other religious teacher or dignitary as such. Contracting of polygamous or plural marriages hereafter is prohibited."



Or for charitable, industrial, educational, or benevolent purposes, to any person, corporation, or community not under the absolute control of Porto Rico.

The first change that is made is to leave out of the section which I have just read the words "or for charitable, industrial, educational, or benevolent purposes, to any person, corporation, or community not under the absolute control of Porto Rico."

The preceding part of the section as to religious sects, priests, and so forth, is left as it was originally.

The circumstances which suggested this amendment of the law were quite numerous. One of them, for instance, was the desire of Porto Rico to send 12 young men each year to the United States to be educated in the United States at the expense of the island. It was held by the Attorney General that under the provision which I have just read the island was prohibited from doing that.

Another case arose in the effort to provide money, at public expense, to be used by certain charitable institutions to take care of earthquake sufferers. That was prohibited by the provision which I have just read. That is the first change the bill makes in the existing law. The next change is simply to increase the amount of public indebtedness which the island may incur from 7 per cent of the taxable value of the property to 10 per cent, it having been demonstrated that in the town of San Juan, for instance, on account of the small taxable value of the property and the comparatively slow increase in wealth, the city was unable to provide an adequate water system under the limitation of 7 per cent. It was deemed by the House of Representatives and by the Senate committee that it was reasonable to increase the limit to 10 per cent.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator whether that limitation extends to municipalities and applies to public purposes of the character to which the Senator has just referred? The Senator will recall that in Territorial days the limitation placed by Congress upon the right of municipalities in the Territories to create indebtedness was fixed at 4 per cent. To go beyond that and permit an indebtedness of 10 per cent seems to me very dangerous. The conditions justifying such action must be extraordinary.

Mr. POINDEXTER. They are quite extraordinary. I think the Senator is justified in asking for information in regard to the matter, and I will call attention briefly to the conditions. The provisions of the existing law relate to municipalities. The law provides:

No public indebtedness of Porto Rico, or of any subdivision or municipality thereof, shall be authorized or allowed in excess of 7 per cent of the aggregate tax valuation of its property.

This amendment proposes to strike out "seven" and insert "ten." The consideration is stated as follows:

Porto Rico is as yet poor as compared with any portion of the United States. Under Spanish rule the island was kept poor by the exactions of the Spanish Government. Most of the accumulation of property has been made within 20 years under the American occupancy. Progress has been made which on the whole has been remarkable. Still it is impossible to provide for schools and the necessary public buildings and other improvements demanded by the progress and development of the island. Especially is this true in the remote rural sections and municipalities. The current rates of interest paid range from 10 to 18 per cent. The amount of money in circulation is very small, amounting to about \$4 per capita. Even the rapidly growing capital city, San Juan, finds it impossible to provide an adequate water system with the limitation of 7 per cent, as provided in the organic act. In many parts of the island schoolhouses can not be built to provide school facilities for the children because of this limitation. Only about 65 per cent of the school population have adequate school facilities.

It is a very bad condition, and it was considered that the circumstances justify this increase.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### FORCIBLE ENTRY AND DETAINER.

The bill (S. 4746) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, in relation to forcible entry and detainer," was announced as next in order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I object to the consideration of that bill, Mr. President.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if I can, I desire to move to take up this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I understand under the unanimous-consent agreement only uncontested matters can be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not so construe the rule. The Chair thinks that is what Senators tried to do, but he does not think they did it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I beg the Chair's pardon. I assumed that we were proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement to consider uncontested matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; this is taking the place of Calendar Monday, and that rule reads:

*Provided, however,* That on Mondays the calendar shall be called under Rule VIII, and during the morning hour no motion shall be entertained to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the calendar except the motion to continue the consideration of a bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject against objection as provided in Rule VIII.

It is provided in Rule VIII that when an objection is interposed a motion may be made to continue the consideration of the subject.

The Chair thinks that the Committee on Rules did not intend it that way, but the Chair is compelled to rule that on Calendar Monday no motion is in order to take up a bill until it is reached on the call of the calendar; and then, if there is an objection, that a motion may be made to continue the consideration of the bill notwithstanding the objection.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I simply want to say that that will do away with Calendar Monday in the future.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think it takes care of it. As one member of the Committee on Rules, I understood that it meant that a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill regularly reached on the calendar could be made, and the Senate could permit it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. If the bill is taken up on motion, then is debate limited to five minutes?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Rule VIII expressly provides that if the Senate determines to proceed with the measure, the operation of the 5-minute rule ceases, and the measure can be considered in the usual way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

On a division, the motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4746) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, in relation to forcible entry and detainer."

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harris	McNary	Smoot
Ball	Harrison	Moses	Spencer
Borah	Heflin	New	Stanley
Brandegee	Henderson	Owen	Sterling
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Page	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Swanson
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Thomas
Dillingham	Kellogg	Pittman	Trammell
Edge	Kenyon	Poincxter	Underwood
Elkins	Keyes	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Fernald	King	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kirby	Reed	Warren
France	Knox	Sheppard	Williams
Glass	La Follette	Smith, Ariz.	Willis
Gooding	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	
Gronna	McKellar	Smith, Md.	
Hale	McLean	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Wolcott] is detained by reason of illness.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Chamberlain] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Johnson] are absent on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there has been no statement from the advocates of this bill, so far as I have been able to ascertain, indicating any emergency existing justifying its enactment. This bill, if it should be enacted, would deprive the District of Columbia of the ordinary and familiar remedy of any owner of property which is common to practically every State in the Union. It would require the owner of property to

bring a suit, at great expense and with great delay, in a court of record for ejectment before he could enforce the terms of a lease.

In the case of property of any kind, whether it is great or whether it is small, that is held by a tenant in the District of Columbia at a certain rental agreed upon in the contract, for a certain term, when that term expires the owner of the property has a right, under the Code of the District of Columbia, to bring suit for forcible entry and detainer in the magistrate's court to recover his property for any purpose for which he may want to use it, or for the purpose of selling it.

If this bill becomes a law he will be deprived of that remedy, and the tenant could continue indefinitely to hold the property after the term of the lease has expired, pending the prosecution of a suit in the Supreme Court of the District for its recovery. In that way it would limit one of the fundamental rights of a citizen of the United States. It would fundamentally change the nature of property in the District of Columbia, in so far as remedies for enforcing property rights are concerned. It is true that an owner could go into the Supreme Court and prosecute a case for its recovery, and would be required to do that, however plain and undisputed the facts might be as to the expiration of the lease.

When the war was on, when it was charged that the owners of property in the District of Columbia were guilty of profiteering, of unconscionable impositions upon people who were compelled to have houses or apartments in which to live, as a war measure probably Congress would have been justified in enacting such a law as this. It is possible that there may be conditions in the District of Columbia now which justify it, but I have not heard any statement of them at all. It seems to me that before Congress passes this measure and deprives the people of the District of Columbia of a remedy for the recovery of property, which is an ancient one and almost a universal one throughout the United States, there ought to be some showing made to Congress as to the need for such unusual legislation, and the need ought to be a very pressing one.

One of the fundamental elements of individual liberty in the United States is the right to the ownership of property. As I recollect it, that is one of the first things enumerated in the great Virginia Bill of Rights as constituting one of the inherent rights of man; that is, the right to own property. While this would not destroy the principle of property, it would modify and limit it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUTHERLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understood the Senator to say that the bill would confer jurisdiction on the Supreme Court in such cases. I do not so read it. I understand that it refers to the municipal court, and that is not the court the Senator had in mind. I do not understand that the case must be brought in the Supreme Court. It is in the municipal court that the case is to be brought. Is not the Senator in error in regard to that?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think not. I think I am not in error. I may not have made my statement clear, and the fact that there is a misunderstanding about that illustrates, I think, the inadvisability of enacting this legislation at this time, without an opportunity for very full discussion of it.

Mr. BORAH. I will say to the Senator that he is in error in regard to that. It does not deprive the municipal court of jurisdiction. It simply gives a little longer notice to the tenant; that is all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. My understanding is that it does deprive it of jurisdiction in the case I have mentioned. I am somewhat surprised to hear that there is any difference of opinion about that on the part of those who are familiar with the bill. As the law now stands, at the expiration of a lease, or for any forfeiture of a lease, the lessor can go into the municipal court and bring an action of forcible entry and detainer. The purpose of this bill is to amend the law of forcible entry and detainer and modify it, curtail it, so that only in certain particular cases can he go into the municipal court to recover, and in all cases except those which are enumerated in this amended law he will be compelled to go into the Supreme Court. Otherwise there is no purpose in passing the bill. If owners of property would have the same remedies after this bill was enacted, the action of forcible entry and detainer in the municipal court, that they have now under the Code of the District of Columbia, what is the purpose of enacting the bill? The purpose of the bill is to limit and to curtail the jurisdiction of the municipal court in those cases, to confine it to certain special conditions, and to leave the lessor to his remedy in the Supreme Court in all other cases.

That is the purpose of the bill. Otherwise, it has no purpose at all.

I stated a case where the lease had expired by limit of time. As the Code of the District of Columbia is now an action of forcible entry and detainer could be brought for the recovery of the property without giving any particular reason at all why the owner wanted to recover his property. He could recover it for any lawful use; he could recover it if he wanted to sell or convey it to somebody else on the expiration of the tenant's lease. But, if this bill passes, he could not bring an action of forcible entry and detainer in the municipal court, I will say to the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], because it is amended so as to limit it to certain specific cases, and the case of the expiration of the lease by time is not included within those specific cases.

There was an amendment agreed to on the floor of the Senate some time ago, as I recollect, while the bill was under consideration, somewhat enlarging the class of cases in which the lessor might bring an action of forcible entry and detainer, as compared with those which are mentioned in the original bill. But, notwithstanding the adoption of that amendment, he would be limited to a specified number of cases and conditions, and those do not include the expiration of the lease by time.

I do not think the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] will dispute that proposition. I think the Senator from Idaho will admit that if this bill passes, an action of forcible entry and detainer can not be brought in the municipal court, as it can be at the present time, under the code, in certain cases. It can only be brought in certain other cases which are specified in this bill. Among those cases is the one I have just mentioned, which is the most ordinary case, of expiration of a lease.

I assert that would be the effect of the passage of the bill, after considerable examination of it, and after hearing the debate and hearing the amendments which were offered by the Senator from South Dakota, and which were adopted on the floor of the Senate, which specified that if he desired to recover the property for the purpose of occupying it, the owner might recover it by the action of forcible entry and detainer, but did not specify a great number of cases which are included in the present code.

On the former discussion of the bill a case was called to the attention of the Senate in which the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, as I recollect it, had held that the general legislation relating to tenants and lessors which had been enacted by Congress during the war, providing for the creation of a rent commission, investing in that commission arbitrary power to fix rentals and to hold that certain rentals were unreasonable, was unconstitutional. They went into quite an extensive, and I think quite convincing, exposition of the law relative to property, and held that one of the essences of property was the right to sell it. If a man can not dispose of property which he owns, it is manifest that its value to him is lessened.

Notwithstanding the fact that that act was passed during the war, probably as a war measure, the court held that it was unconstitutional, a violation of the constitutional privileges of a citizen of the United States. I do not hold that this bill, if enacted, would be unconstitutional, and I only cite the case to which I have referred as bearing upon the general policy of this kind of legislation.

This bill, as it has been amended, would still vest in this rent commission power to fix the rates at which property shall be rented, and while it would not deprive the owner of all remedy in case he did not comply with the findings of the rent commission, it would deprive him of certain remedies. It would deprive him of a speedy remedy. It would deprive him of the privilege of going into the municipal court and filing an action of forcible entry and detainer, and recovering the property if the tenant of the property is willing to accept the rate that is fixed by this commission, which was established by Congress as one of the acts growing out of the emergencies of war, and compel the lessor to go into the Supreme Court of the District. Every lawyer in the Senate knows what that means. It means, in the first place, that he has to employ a lawyer and pay him a fee. He has to pay the costs of the proceeding in the supreme court, and he has to wait until the time of the summons has expired, he has to wait until the period for answer or demurrer has expired, and has to wait on the postponements of the case and continuation from week to week and month by month, which are familiar, and which obviously can be taken advantage of by any tenant occupying the property who desires to continue in its possession, when he really has no right to continue in it, because he is continuing in violation of the terms of his lease. That is the effect of this bill, and while probably it would not come within the ruling made by the Court of Appeals of the



District of Columbia, because it does leave him a remedy, such as it is, nevertheless it is a continuance of the same policy to the extent of depriving him of an adequate and speedy remedy, which was condemned by the court of appeals in the decision to which I have referred. I am not mistaken about that, I will say to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. We have only about a minute left. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to let the bill pass?

Mr. POINDEXTER. If it were a matter in which the Senator from Idaho had any personal interest, or if it affected his State, I would allow it to pass. But it is not a matter in which he is personally interested, and I believe it is a very important bill, and that the invasion of the rights of the individual citizen, in so far as remedies are concerned, which would result if this bill were passed, would be entirely unjustifiable in a time of profound peace, however the case might be in time of war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. A bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products, to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill which has just been before the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that the unfinished business is the so-called emergency tariff bill, and that it is now the order of business before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is now the business before the Senate, without a motion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. A motion has been made to proceed to the consideration of the bill which has been before the Senate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hale	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Harris	Moses	Smith, Md.
Borah	Harrison	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Heflin	Nelson	Smoot
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	New	Spencer
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Stanley
Curtis	Kellogg	Owen	Sutherland
Dial	Kendrick	Pittman	Thomas
Dillingham	Kenyon	Poinexter	Townsend
Edge	Keyes	Pomerene	Trammell
Elkins	King	Ransdell	Underwood
Fernald	La Follette	Reed	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Lentfoot	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Glass	Lodge	Sherman	Walsh, Mont.
Gooding	McCumber	Shields	Willis.
Gore	McKellar	Simmons	
Gronna	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

#### EMERGENCY TARIFF.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that the motion which is now pending is the motion made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to proceed to the consideration of the bill that was before the Senate when the hour of 2 o'clock arrived. That is the motion which is pending?

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the motion pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So the Chair understands.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, we have as the unfinished business the emergency tariff bill. A motion is made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to displace that as the unfinished business and to substitute therefor the bill pertaining to the matter of leases in the District of Columbia. The immediate question before the Senate is, therefore, the relative importance of the two bills and whether the emergency tariff bill reported by the Committee on Finance should give way to a bill the purpose of which is, as I understand, to enable tenants to hold over after the expiration of their lease.

While I can not speak at all for the landlords or for the tenants, as I am not acquainted with the particular wording of the bill, certainly the number affected by it are infinitesimal as compared with the vast number of people affected by this proposed emergency tariff legislation.

The emergency tariff bill covers generally agricultural products—the grain, stock-raising, meat, and wool industries. The population in the grain section of the Northwest affected directly and who are suffering most by reason of heavy importations—those in eastern Montana, all of North and South Dakota, and Minnesota—number about 4,500,000 people. The number

of people in the United States who are dependent upon grain raising may be fairly estimated at nearly 30,000,000 of people. So the real question here is whether the 30,000,000 people desperately interested in the result of legislation before the Senate shall have their bill swept aside for the interests of a few people in the District of Columbia who can not agree with their landlords as to whether they shall quit the premises.

I do not think that any Senator can fail to understand the desperate situation in certain agricultural sections of the United States. I will take the State of North Dakota alone, where, during the last two months, according to the last report that I have, 32 banks have failed. They include not only State banks, but also national banks. I have not seen any reports from that State for the last week, so it may be that three or four more banks have closed during that period. I find a somewhat similar situation affecting those who are interested in woolgrowing and in the banks that have been financing that industry.

The trouble in my State is due to two causes: First, a very light crop—and in some sections the crop has been light for several years—and, secondly, to the vast amount of importations absolutely duty free of the same kind of grain, which is ground at the same mills and produces the same grade of flour. So, Mr. President, I want to give somewhat in detail the situation in the northwestern section of this country where the farmers depend entirely upon their spring-wheat crop.

We may divide the United States, so far as wheat raising generally is concerned, into eight different sections, each one of those sections growing an entirely different kind and grade of wheat, each of which produces a different kind of flour. These different species of grain may be mixed to a slight extent, but only to a slight extent, without changing the grade of flour. Therefore, in considering the wheat question we must consider not only distinct species but those species as being produced in distinct sections of the country and in some instances far separated. You may raise a certain kind of melon in one section of the country and another kind of melon in another section of the country. While the price of one may affect the consumption of the other, they are not at all dependent upon each other for their particular value in the markets of the country.

We raise a wheat which produces what is called the "hard wheat flour," that has a reputation throughout the world. The millers of Minneapolis and the Northwest generally are engaged almost exclusively in the production of that kind of flour. They must depend upon the spring-wheat section of the United States to secure a sufficient number of bushels of wheat to meet their demands. If the production of wheat in that section is about equal to the consumption of the mills, we will generally secure a very fair price for our crop. If it is a little less than the consumption demand, our price very naturally advances. If we have proper protection the price may advance to the full extent of the protection. If there is a good crop in Canada—which raises exactly the same kind of grain that we do—even though our crop is below average, the moment that our price increases a few cents a bushel above the Canadian price the Canadian wheat, under absolutely free importation, naturally flows over the border and drives the price of the American product downward. Mr. President, that is the situation in our State.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Does the Senator from North Dakota seriously contend that the mere difference of 1 or 2 or 3 cents a bushel in the price of wheat is going materially to change the market conditions along the border?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes; of course it makes a difference when wheat comes into this country absolutely free. The Senator must cast his eye over the great Red River Valley, which is nearly 200 miles wide at the north end of my State, taking in Minnesota and North Dakota and extending as far north as Winnipeg. It produces the same kind of grain; there is not a foot of waste land; one field merges into another; and the railways all cross the line. Therefore the Canadian wheat is taken over the border and immediately drives down our prices to the Canadian level.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I do not care to interrupt the Senator's argument, but I remember the same argument was made during the pendency of the Canadian reciprocity measure.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. POMERENE. I remember that the Senator from North Dakota at that time made an argument along the same line that he is pursuing now. A few days after that he called attention to the fact that the wheat on the Canadian side was a

little lower than it was on this side, and about a week after that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] made a speech in support of the Canadian reciprocity measure and gave a list of, as I now recall, 20 or 25 different markets on both sides of the Canadian line in most of which the price of wheat on the Canadian side was higher than it was on this side.

I refer to these matters because I am not disturbed about the little differences in the market. I remember, for instance, in my own State, picking up the market reports as between Canton and Akron, 23 miles apart, both very substantial cities, and there may be a difference of 5 cents a bushel in the two markets. The same is true as between Akron and Dayton, or between Akron and Toledo. That condition may exist everywhere. A mere change of a few cents in one market or another means nothing as a general proposition.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no; the mere fluctuation means nothing; but when the whole season's crop is held higher or lower, on a range of from 10 to 20 cents a bushel, it means a great deal. There may be a bullish market in Chicago; at the same time there may be a bearish market in Minneapolis; the one market price may go up and the other may go down, but the general trend of prices as between the two markets will bear about the same relation to each other, and the general trend between the Canadian and the American market will show exactly the same continued relation.

I know that it is often contended that our export market fixes the price of wheat. Mr. President, a great deal of wheat is raised in California, and a considerable portion of it used to go into the export trade. I do not know whether California now raises wheat for export; but suppose California should raise more wheat than could be consumed within the borders of the State or along the Pacific coast, what would she do with it? Would the price which she might receive affect the price of the wheat produced east of the Rocky Mountains? She could not ship her grain east of the Rocky Mountains; it would be impossible; the freight rates would eat it up before it got as far as Minneapolis. She could ship it to Shanghai or grind it into flour and export the flour to Shanghai, but her export price would have not the slightest effect upon the price of grain grown in Ohio or in Michigan or in the spring-wheat raising States. That is true to a certain extent of the grain raised in Texas and in Oklahoma and a portion of Kansas. That grain may find its market either in Kansas City or at the Gulf ports; they have their own market for that kind of wheat and their own market for the character of flour ground from that wheat. So of the grain raised in Ohio and West Virginia and Maryland. It is practically the same kind of grain, is sold in the same market, and makes the same kind of flour.

But what does fix the price of grain in the United States? Is there any general rule that can be applied? The general rule that can not be applied is what is called the Liverpool market. The general rule which can be applied is the rule of world production and consumption; that rule affects the market price of all grains throughout the world. But the most important thing that fixes the price of the American wheat is the price at the principal place of consumption.

The principal place of consumption for the wheat raised in the United States is the United States. It would be foolish to claim if we consume 650,000,000 bushels of wheat in the United States and 100,000,000 bushels of American wheat are consumed in England that the English price rather than the consumption price in America fixes the price of our product. Of course, there will be a relation between the two, because both are affected by the world's supply and demand.

As I remember, in 1909 or 1910 we had rather a short crop in the Northwestern States, and Liverpool and Minneapolis quoted practically the same price for the same kind of grain for several months during the time that the crop was being raised. Why? Because at that time we had a tariff barrier of from 25 to 30 cents a bushel. The American buying Canadian wheat would be compelled to pay the tariff. Our crop being light—and it is when the crop is light that the wheat farmer is entitled to the better price—the millers had to raise the price in order to continue the proper flow of grain. So our prices stayed up to about the Liverpool price, simply because the Canadian grain could not come in without paying a duty. Therefore, the theory that the price of American wheat is fixed by Liverpool is a fallacy of the worst character. The price is fixed by the world's supply and demand, and is affected more seriously by the supply and demand in the United States.

Now, I want to call the attention of the Senate, before I get down to the real crux of this situation, to certain facts that bear directly upon it. I want to take cognizance of the 1920 crop of the United States and Canada.

The estimated crop of the United States for 1920 is 789,878,000 bushels. We shall need for food, according to this estimate,

530,000,000 bushels, and for seed 82,000,000 bushels, leaving us a surplus of the 1920 crop for export of 177,878,000 bushels. Turning to Canada, we find that their estimated crop for 1920 is 293,361,000 bushels. They will need for food in Canada 45,000,000 bushels, and for seed 28,000,000 bushels, leaving a surplus of Canadian wheat to be exported of 220,361,000 bushels. So you will see that while we have for export of our 1920 crop only about 178,000,000 bushels, Canada has for export of her 1920 crop, of exactly the same kind of wheat, about 220,000,000 bushels. I have not included whatever surplus might have remained in the United States and in Canada from the 1919 crop, but I assume that the relative proportions after making allowance for this surplus will be about the same.

Canada, having 220,000,000 bushels of wheat to export, must necessarily look for the best market in which she can dispose of that grain. Of course, she will send it to the nearest market if she can secure as good a price as she can by sending it across the ocean to a foreign market; and here comes into play the difference in the exchange of the American dollar and the Canadian dollar.

Take a period of about the last three months, and I think the difference is about 15 per cent in favor of the American dollar. Therefore, Canada can not only put her wheat into the United States free, but, measured by the Canadian dollar and the American dollar, she can sell it in the United States at an advantage of 15 per cent over the Canadian price without paying any tariff whatever. That gives the importer a vast advantage. On every dollar's worth of imported wheat he can make 15 cents by reason of the difference in exchange.

Now, I want to show Senators just exactly how this will operate.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOODING in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. I simply want to ask the Senator if he has taken the trouble to ascertain, in case a certain quantity of wheat is exported to this country from Canada, and in case that wheat is here converted into flour, or is exported from the warehouses here directly to Great Britain or to any European port, whether—

Mr. McCUMBER. Some of it will be converted into flour for export, but only a small proportion. By far the greater proportion is converted into flour and sold in the United States.

Mr. SIMMONS. But that is not the question which I proposed to ask the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. I thought that was the question.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was simply prefacing my question by that statement. My question is this: In case wheat purchased in this country from Canada is exported from this country to Europe, either in the form of flour or in the form of wheat, what will be the advantage in the price that we will be able to get for that wheat in Europe by reason of the difference in exchange value as compared with the advantage which the Canadian would get on the same quantity of wheat if imported into this country for the same reason?

Mr. McCUMBER. The general advantage is this: You glut the market at any time with any wheat, you have more than the mills can take care of, and you destroy the immediate demand, and that necessarily sends prices downward. Some of this wheat, we will say, is converted into flour, and we will say that some of that flour is exported.

I do not know whether or not we can say that it would be the same flour, but we will say that an equal amount of flour will be exported. Of course, there is a profit on the flour, or it would not be exported at all; but remember, it is bought with depreciated Canadian money, it is sold when it gets to Europe on the basis of the appreciated American dollar, rather than upon the basis of the British currency.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I am not sure that I have yet conveyed to the Senator from North Dakota the thought that I had in my mind. It is this: Of course the difference in exchange in our favor in all international transactions between this country and Canada would give the Canadian an advantage, because of that difference in exchange, in his sales in this market.

Mr. McCUMBER. It would give the person who buys it an advantage.

Mr. SIMMONS. It would give him an advantage in his sales on this market. On the other hand, in our sales of commodities of any character whatsoever—not only of wheat, but of any character whatsoever—to Great Britain, by reason of the same difference in exchange, the advantage is very much in our favor. Now, I ask the Senator if he has compared these advantages and disadvantages, and ascertained whether the advantage of the



Canadian in the sale of the wheat to this country was greater or less than the advantage of the American in the sale of that identical wheat, or some equal quantity of wheat, to Europe by reason of the difference in exchange?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not considering so much the advantage of the Canadian as I am considering the advantage of the American buyer in buying Canadian wheat with a depreciated Canadian dollar, bringing it into the United States, and either selling it for the advanced value of the American dollar or exporting it upon the American-dollar basis with the advantage in our favor as against Great Britain, the country which takes most of our wheat and flour.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to say to the Senator that I have not asked this question in any controversial spirit.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that.

Mr. SIMMONS. But it occurred to me, in listening to the Senator, that it would be exceedingly enlightening to us, in considering the effect of this difference in exchange in our favor, to know in a concrete case—that of wheat—whether that difference was greater in favor of Canada when we purchase from that country or in our favor when we sell that identical wheat to a European country.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator can very easily make that computation.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thought probably the Senator had made it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not compared it with the British pound. The Senator can easily make the computation by ascertaining the average difference between the American gold dollar and the English currency and find out in that way what advantage we would have over the English in selling to Great Britain.

Let me make this clear. Taking a simple case, suppose that wheat was worth \$1 a bushel in Canada in Canadian money and the American bought it for a dollar. It was worth a dollar in the United States, but the Canadian dollar was worth only 85 cents. Therefore he really purchased it in Canada for 85 cents. The moment he gets it over here, based upon the American dollar, where the quotations are the same, he sells it for a dollar and makes 15 cents a bushel.

Now, holding his dollar-a-bushel wheat, we will suppose that he sells it to Great Britain. When he sells it to Great Britain he does not sell it upon the basis of the depreciated price of the British currency, but he sells it upon the American-dollar price; and if the British money is 15 per cent below the American dollar in value the British will have to pay 15 per cent higher when they purchase the American flour. Just what that difference may be I do not know, because I have made no computation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, of course the Senator will understand that I do not mean to say that there is any difficulty in making this calculation, and I should not have interrupted the Senator with this inquiry if I had not supposed that probably he had already made it.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I have not made the computation comparing the British pound and its present depreciated value, because I was more directly interested in the question of imports and their effect.

Now, I want to give practically the same concrete case that I gave in the committee, which will explain this matter more clearly.

In the month of October, 1913, we imported from Canada 231,464 bushels of wheat. You will see that that was a little over a quarter of a million bushels for the entire year. Now, compare that with the month of October, 1920, when we imported 9,784,307 bushels of which we have a record, or about forty times as many bushels. In fact, we imported very much more, as I can easily explain to the Senator. Along the entire northern line of North Dakota there are elevators on both sides of the boundary on each railway that crosses.

The Canadian during a tariff period can not bring his grain across, even though the elevator may be very much nearer than any elevator in his own country. But the moment you take off your tariff provision and remove your inspectors and agents millions of bushels will come over the border into American elevators of which there is no record whatever, because there is no occasion for making a record.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. Between 1910 and 1920, taking the entire shipments of wheat from Canada into the United States, imports have exceeded the exports by about 8,000,000 bushels, I believe, for the whole 10 years.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not know that I understand the Senator. Does he mean that imports of wheat from Canada exceed exports of wheat to Canada?

Mr. STANLEY. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well.

Mr. STANLEY. I do not give the figures exactly, but in 10 years, according to the reports made by the Department of Commerce, the excess of imports, as I understand, was about 8,000,000 bushels.

Mr. McCUMBER. The exports to Canada were almost nothing, were they not?

Mr. STANLEY. No; the exports to Canada and the imports from Canada were in the aggregate over 100,000,000 bushels in all. Fifty-eight million bushels moved one way and a little over 50,000,000 the other.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will allow me to correct him, or at least place his statement so that it will be better understood, he includes both the wheat and flour. In other words, in the estimates as to the number of bushels which may be exported from Canada I think he will find that most of it is represented in the form of flour and figured upon the basis of 43 bushels to the barrel.

Mr. STANLEY. No; they gave the flour separately. I was surprised to find that up until the last three years exports and imports of wheat had depended upon the nearness of elevators or the facilities for travel, and that there seemed to be no general movement of grain either one way or the other, no great excess either of export or import. But what I wished to ask the Senator was this, To what does he attribute the recent excess of imports of wheat?

Mr. McCUMBER. There are two reasons, Mr. President. The one is the better price. The second is that during 10 years we have had a tariff, and during those years much of the imports have been in bond, the goods simply being imported and shipped right through, by reason of our railways being better equipped, or something of that character. These imports could not be used in the United States, because after paying the tariff there would be no profits. That would account for those being imported in bond; and, of course, as a rule, we have railways along the border which are a little more convenient to all sections than even the Canadians have.

Mr. STANLEY. It has been some time since we have had any considerable duty on wheat to Canada. Does not the Senator believe that this present movement of wheat is due entirely to the difference in the rate of exchange between the two countries?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; not in the Northwest; not entirely; but to a great extent it is due to it. The other feature I mentioned was the rather short crop in the spring-wheat section.

Mr. STANLEY. If it is due to the rate of exchange, it is probable that that matter will adjust itself.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; undoubtedly it will, some time; but that may be years.

Mr. STANLEY. And if it does not adjust itself, the difference in the rate of exchange would in that case measure the amount of duty which would be necessary to prevent this excess of imports, would it not?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes; if we should make the rate of duty equal to the difference in the rate of exchange, they would be put upon a parity, of course. That would be equivalent then to free trade. At present it is a little better than free trade for the importer.

Mr. STANLEY. The proposed duty is more than double the difference in the rate?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes; the proposed duty is to give the American farmer a protection. The proposed duty is to raise the price of his product so that it will measure up somewhere near to what it costs to raise it in the United States. We are trying to give the farmers of the United States a special benefit by this proposed legislation, because of their deplorable condition, which has flowed from the heavy importations of wheat from Canada.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon, and with this question I conclude. Does the Senator believe that a duty sufficiently high upon all agricultural products to prevent any degree of importation from Canada would be a beneficial thing at this time?

Mr. McCUMBER. I certainly do, Mr. President. I would not be supporting this bill if I did not.

Mr. STANLEY. Would not such a duty exclude exports from the United States to Canada, as well as imports from Canada to the United States?

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President, it would not. Canada is going to buy the things she wants where she can get them the

cheapest. If she can get them cheaper in the United States, she will get them from the United States. If she can get them cheaper from Great Britain, she will get them from Great Britain. People sell where they can get the most for their products and they buy where they can buy cheapest; and we are not going to change that rule of human conduct.

Of course, Mr. President, you may say that if we will help enrich Canada, Canada may buy more from us. But that will depend on whether we can sell cheaper than some other country from which Canada can buy.

Mr. STANLEY. International trade is a matter of international barter. The Senator surely does not believe we can erect a wall which will impede the flow of traffic into the United States but will not impede the flow of traffic out of the United States?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I can answer that in a nutshell. For more than 50 years Great Britain has taken practically half of all the exports of the United States. For more than 50 years our exports to Great Britain have been about double what our imports from Great Britain have been. Great Britain has lived during those years, and we have gotten a better price for our products because we held the tariff wall, and it has not destroyed either of the countries. Great Britain made up her differences somewhere else. She may have had a trade with other countries, and her monetary interests, her loans, her investments in other countries might have equalled the difference, so as to place her on more or less of an equality with the United States. But Great Britain bought her wheat and her meats during all of that time where she could buy cheapest. She bought from the United States because she had to. We sold there because we could get a better price there than possibly we could get anywhere else.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I suppose the Senator knows, of course, that the great bulk of the commodities which we sold to Great Britain, including cotton, were agricultural products—

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Which had at the time practically no protection here.

Mr. McCUMBER. We did not need much protection here until the Great Canadian northwest was developed, and then we had protection most of the time.

Mr. THOMAS. I was going to ask a question in connection with that. I have always understood that the difference between our exports and British imports was made up by Great Britain through the investments which she had in the United States prior to the war.

Mr. McCUMBER. Which she had all over the world.

Mr. THOMAS. But the Senator, of course, knows that the importations of Canadian wheat into the United States are not paid for in money. They are paid for in articles of commerce and merchandise which are obtained in exchange, of course, Canada being able now to make these exchanges with profit to herself, because of the difference in the value of her money as compared with that of the United States.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; I do not understand that the exchange is not made in money. We do not trade so many yards of cloth for so much wheat. We pay money for the wheat, and Canada pays money for the cloth. Whatever we import is always converted into money first, and that money will always buy where it will buy cheapest.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator knows the money to which he refers is in the form of acceptances, which represent exports and imports, the only money changing hands being the amount of the difference between the two?

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; it is not always represented in that way. Of course, it is very convenient, so far as it can go, to exchange it that way; but if Great Britain sends us one billion and buys from us \$4,000,000,000 worth of property, it can not all be settled for in acceptances between the two, because our credits are four times as much as that of Great Britain, and the difference must be represented in cash. Of course, the money is not transferred from one country to the other except to cover the balance due one country or the other.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, assuming for the sake of the argument that the Senator is correct, that in our dealings with Great Britain will she continue on the former basis notwithstanding our tariff legislation, or the height of our tariff wall, and will permit us to exclude her commodities without a reciprocal exclusion on her part?

Mr. McCUMBER. She has done it for 50 years, and she will probably continue it just so long as it is to her advantage to do so.

Mr. STANLEY. Assuming that to be true, Canada's policy has been the other way, has it not?

Mr. McCUMBER. Canada has had some protection.

Mr. STANLEY. Canada has been in the habit of levying duties on her products, and of adopting retaliatory measures?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. And she will in all human probability continue that policy?

Mr. McCUMBER. She is doing it now.

Mr. STANLEY. And whenever we put a duty on wheat she will put a duty on some other article?

Mr. McCUMBER. She is doing that this very moment. We are taking everything Canada exports without one penny of duty, while on practically everything we send over to Canada she collects a tariff, and she will continue to do that as long as it is to her advantage to do so, and she will continue to take advantage of our situation to allow her chief products to come in free, while she charges us from 10 to 30 per cent ad valorem duty on the things we send to Canada.

Mr. STANLEY. Has the Senator any statement of the excess of Canadian duties upon imports from this country over our duties on imports into the United States?

Mr. McCUMBER. Canada imports manufactured products. She exports agricultural products. She has a duty levied upon all manufactured products, so far as I know. We have no duty levied upon our importation of agricultural products from Canada.

Mr. STANLEY. I am sure the Senator is laboring under a misapprehension. Canada is to-day, and has been for the last 10 years, purchasing much more of our agricultural products than she has ever sold. In tobacco alone Canada purchases more than the entire excess of her wheat exportations in the last 10 years.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course, Mr. President, Canada does not raise any tobacco, and she has to import it, and as Canadians are all good smokers, they buy the American product. They would buy it somewhere else if they could buy it cheaper.

Mr. STANLEY. She can buy her tobacco elsewhere. She imports enormous quantities of peanuts, but she can buy them elsewhere. She imports millions of dollars worth of flaxseed every year, but she can buy that elsewhere. She imports fruits of all kinds, millions of dollars worth, but she can buy them elsewhere. If the bill becomes a law and goes into effect and Canada reciprocates by raising her tariff duties over what they are now proportionately to what we raise ours, the naked loss in trade to the United States will be five times as great as the total of the wheat importation into the United States, and if Canada reciprocates by putting an export duty on pulp paper and we take \$500,000,000 worth of it a year, the amount of wheat sold will be a mere bagatelle in comparison with that stupendous loss.

Mr. McCUMBER. Canada is not going to cut her own throat in any kind of a commercial war between herself and the United States. When we send our tobacco over to Canada she collects duty, and a good duty, too. When she sends her wheat into the United States we do not collect one penny of duty. If we are going to have reciprocity, let us have it. The advantage to-day is entirely with the Canadians. We can not send a thing over there on which we do not pay a duty. If she can get her peanuts any cheaper in China than she can get them from North or South Carolina, she is going to get them from China, tariff or no tariff. When the merchant buys his stock to sell he buys it where he can buy it the cheapest. In business he is not possessed of a single ounce of international altruism. He does not care anything for reciprocity. What he is looking for is the price at which he can buy a thing and the price at which he can sell it. The idea that we can not sell to any country unless we buy freely what that country produces has not the slightest application in this case.

But, Mr. President, I was diverted a little while. I was showing the difference between the Canadian exports to the United States for the years just prior to the war and for the year 1920. I showed that in October, 1920, the Canadian imports were forty times as much as they were in any month of a previous year. In November, 1913, we imported 104,000 bushels, while our importations in 1920 for the same month were about 10,000,000 bushels. In December, 1913, we imported 127,000 bushels, and that was all, while in December, 1920, we imported 12,000,000 bushels, or one hundred times as many bushels in November, 1920, as we imported in November, 1913.



The excessive importations of wheat began about the middle of September, 1920. I wish Senators who think these importations had no influence upon our prices to note the decline in the price of American wheat concurrent with the vast importations of Canadian wheat. The Modern Miller, in Russell's weekly wheat report, shows the importation from Canada for the whole year—and that has all come within a few months—of 53,000,000 bushels, while the imports of wheat converted into flour, or flour with its equivalent in wheat, were 3,390,475 bushels. This would give us a total importation of wheat from the 1920 crop of about 61,390,475 bushels, and this, added to our 178,000,000 bushels for export, would force us to provide for the export of 239,268,475 bushels of the 1920 crop.

If that were all we had to look out for, we might cease our concern, because Canada has already imported that, and any legislation that we can pass will not affect the amount of grain that is in the United States that is at present depressing our crop price. But when we stop to consider there are 150,000,000 bushels more in the same granary, that has ceased moving only because of the frozen lakes, then we can see what the result will be the moment the transportation is reopened.

I have already spoken of the exchange and the difference in exchange. I wish to present that so that Senators will not misunderstand the operation of the law of supply and demand as affected by the difference in exchange.

On December 14, 1920—and I take that because that is the date on which I looked up the situation—No. 1 hard wheat in Chicago was \$1.84 per bushel. On the same day No. 1 hard Winnipeg Canadian wheat was \$1.85 per bushel. It was really 1 cent a bushel higher than ours on that same day in Canadian currency. However, we must not be misled too much by that alone, because the Canadian No. 1 hard is a better wheat for flour than the American No. 1 hard, not because of the difference in the quality of the two wheats, but because the Canadian rules for grading require a greater proportion of actual hard wheat for No. 1 hard than is required in Minneapolis.

Under ordinary conditions, I presume that would make 5 cents difference in value of the Canadian wheat over our No. 1 hard. At present prices it might make even 8 cents a bushel difference.

Let us see how this exchange difference is taken advantage of by the importer to the detriment of the producer. The average rate of Canadian exchange in American money during several months past has been approximately 15 per cent. On wheat, at \$1.84 per bushel, Chicago, the difference in rate of exchange would make a difference of 27 cents a bushel. The bill proposes a duty of 30 cents per bushel, which would be 3 cents above the exchange difference, and has been amended in the committee to 40 cents, which would give an actual protection of about 13 cents per bushel. The price of No. 1 hard wheat in Winnipeg, Canadian currency, was then \$1.85, less 15 per cent exchange, which would be 27½ cents, making the price in Winnipeg, in United States currency, \$1.85, less 27½ cents, or \$1.57½. That is really what the American paid when he bought in Canada.

I think that I ought to explain again, because Senators do not seem to understand that Winnipeg quotations do not mean wheat delivered in Winnipeg. Winnipeg is not a wheat market at all. These quotations are for wheat delivered at some point on the Lakes, either at Fort William, Port Huron, or some other point of Lake export, and have nothing to do with the local price in Winnipeg.

The Chicago market of \$1.84, less \$1.57½, means 27½ cents per bushel that the American would make in buying Canadian grain quoted at the same price, or even 1 cent a bushel more than the American wheat. So that Senators can see why it is that we have been bringing in this vast quantity of wheat.

If we will look at the prices of grain during the months this enormous quantity was coming into the United States, we will find that the price of the American product went down just to the extent that Canadian grain was shipped into the United States. I will begin with September 13, 1920. I have only taken my figures from the weekly reports, and therefore this was the end of the week on September 13.

Wheat, No. 1 northern, which is our standard grade in Minneapolis, was \$2.63½ cents per bushel on that date. Just at this time began the importation. Between that date, September 13, and October 1 there were imported about 1,750,000 bushels, far more than were exported on the average in any previous single year, and on October 4 the price had gone down to \$2.07, a loss of 61½ cents per bushel. That was not because of just this one importation, but because there were 200,000,000 bushels more of the same wheat that was ready to come into the American market.

During the month of October the report shows that Canada exported into the United States 9,800,438 bushels. In Novem-

ber we imported wheat to the amount of 10,000,000 bushels, and on November 29 the same grade of wheat had dropped to \$1.53 a bushel, making a total loss since September 13 of \$1.15½ per bushel. I do not know whether this has reached the lowest possible level or not.

We hear considerably about the raising of the price to the ultimate consumer. I wish to heaven that some Senators could have gone out onto some of the farms in my State and western Minnesota last fall, when the grain crop was so poor and producing so little in the straw that it cost from 30 to 40 cents a bushel for thrashing alone, and have seen the farmers, some of whom rented their farms, attempting to struggle along, exchanging work with each other when they could, for they were unable to pay the enormous prices that were demanded for labor. Labor required to perform the work on the farm at that time commanded from \$6 to \$8 a day in the busy season of the year. There was not a farmer, of course, who could have paid it. He could not have paid it even in good times. A bill has been introduced and is being pressed by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] to pay as the lowest minimum wage \$1,080 a year. What a heaven that would afford for five or six different families out there upon the prairies during the hard, cold winter!

I have occasion sometimes as I drive home in this city to see the young girls piling out of Government offices, and I can not help but note the fine furs that nearly all of them are wearing; they are queenly dressed as compared with the poor and rather shabby dresses and old shawls and old, threadbare coats that I see worn by the mothers and daughters who are struggling upon the farm; yet it is proposed to give \$1,080 a year to every one of these finely clad girls as the very minimum, and from that up to \$2,000 a year.

I wish to heaven that you could appreciate the real situation. I think the time is coming when we have got to recognize in this country that the man who raises wheat or raises cotton has as much right to live as has the laborer in the city or the Government; that he has a right—a God-given right—to receive a compensation that will measure up proportionately to the comparatively enormous wages that must be paid in every city in the United States to maintain the standard of high living in the cities.

A short time ago, while visiting in California and stopping at a certain place, I saw every day a beautiful limousine come up to a house on the opposite side of the street. I asked for what the limousine was used and whose it was. I was answered that it belonged to the colored cook, who every day made the journey to cook for the family living there, for which service she received a hundred dollars a month. It is desired to protect that class; it is proposed to pass a bill here to provide that no laborer working for the Government shall be paid less than \$1,080 a year; but the moment the Congress is asked to do something for the struggling people upon the farms, who have not any money with which to go to the movies or to pay \$4 for a theater seat, they are struck with horror because it will raise the price of bread to poor laboring people. I think that the farmer has as much right to clothe his wife and his daughters and his sons decently as the people in the cities have to spend hundreds of dollars for shows, and who keep every one of the amusement places packed from top to bottom during the entire year.

What awful offense is there in asking for legislation favorable to the farmers? The man who in the city gets \$8 for a day and a quarter's work can with that amount buy a barrel of flour, which is all he uses for himself for the entire year; in other words, the wage of one and a quarter days' work of a carpenter in the city of Washington buys all the flour that carpenter uses during an entire year. If the price of flour should be doubled from what it is to-day, he would have to do two and a half days' work in order to enable him to secure flour to last him the whole year. What an awful imposition that would be!

Suppose that even 50 cents a bushel were added to the price of wheat—and the pending bill only proposes a duty of 40 cents; and would only give a real protection of 13 cents—and if were passed on to the ultimate consumer, that would add but \$2.25, we will say, to a barrel of flour. It would make the carpenter work one-quarter of a day longer than he is now working in order to get the farmer's wheat for a year's supply. It would not mean anything to him, but it would mean an immense amount to the farmer who is to-day struggling, and to the banks that have been trying to supply him with funds in the falling market and have extended their credit until in some cases they have had to close their doors.

I am merely pleading for justice to the producers on the farm. Senators talk about enacting legislation which will tend

to send people out of the cities and back to the farm. If it is desired to make farming more attractive, there is but one thing, Mr. President, which attracts people in this world, and that is the luring glow of the gold, the glitter of the dollar. Whenever you make farming pay, whenever you so legislate as to give the American market to the American farmer—who, before Heaven, has earned it—you will do something to bring the people out of the cities onto the farms; but just so long as the laborer can get ten times as much in the city as he can on the farm, and so long as he can have the pleasures of city life, denied to the farmer, you are not going to induce him by any kind of suggestion to get out onto the farm.

The virtue I see in the bill of the Senator from California providing a minimum wage is that it raises the wages of the least-paid employees and brings them nearer to a righteous standard. Now, let us do the same for the farmer. Nothing on earth we can do for him will, within our lifetime, place him on a parity with those living in our cities, so far as the ease and pleasures of life are concerned; but we can help him. How? By giving him the American market, which belongs to him, by giving him that advantage over the foreign producers.

The price of land in Canada is not half what it is in my State; the farmer in America has got to pay a greater interest charge if he purchases land. Why, then, let the cheaper produced commodity of Canada, grown upon cheaper land, even though the cost of labor in the western portion of Canada may be nearly equal to that in northern United States, absorb our market to the detriment of our own people?

Mr. President, I am speaking only for the wheat section. There are other Senators who can discuss this bill as it affects the wool producer much better than can I. I am merely asking for justice for a section of the country which is in sore need. I am appealing to Senators to lay aside their purpose to blockade a bill that is designed to aid a class of people who, God knows, need it to-day. Let those who desire present their arguments in opposition to the position which I am taking, but when they have stated their arguments and have explained their attitude let us come to a vote and determine whether or not a majority of the Senate desires to extend a helping hand.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I am always interested in what the Senator from North Dakota says, particularly when he speaks of the distress of the farmers of North Dakota. Some of them have been in distress; their crops have been blighted by inclement weather and by other causes; I realize that very fully; but I wish to put a question to the Senator. Last week I was in the city of Cincinnati. Upon inquiry I found that the shops there were only running about 40 per cent of their capacity. I am advised that in the great iron and steel centers of Ohio the mills are running about 50 per cent of their capacity. I have in mind at the present time a great manufacturing plant which ordinarily employs about 30,000 men, but which to-day is employing about 7,000. I have in mind another plant which employs, ordinarily, about 9,000 men; it is closed down now. I have in mind another plant that employs, ordinarily, about 4,800 men, whereas now it is employing about 700 men. There is not an industrial center in the State of Ohio or in western Pennsylvania or in New York or Illinois that is not more or less very seriously affected by nonemployment. The other day, adding to my distress of mind, when I picked up one of the Ohio newspapers I found that in the city of Toledo already there had been formed a bread line of 2,000 men; and a day later I found on reading another newspaper that that morning the authorities had to feed 1,200 men for breakfast and to give them baskets of food to take home to their families. Then, I turn to this bill, and I find a duty placed on wheat; I find 8 cents a pound duty added to butter, and as much added to cheese, and in the same relative proportion increased duty is proposed to be levied upon nearly all the substantial food products of the country. What are we to do for those who are now out of employment?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Some days ago I offered an amendment to the pending bill and was accused by the newspapers of being facetious. The amendment provided that the revenues to be derived from the bill should be devoted to supporting those who are involuntarily out of employment. It occurred to me that if we were going to protect one suffering class of the community, the same motives and the same purposes sought to be subserved would apply equally to other needy members of

society. To the extent to which that amendment may be effective it might afford some relief in the direction to which the Senator's remarks are leading.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, that would have the merit at least of having some equity in it; but I can not understand the frame of mind of men who approach this subject when we know, if we believe one-half of what is in the public prints, that to-day there are at least three or four million men out of employment; and when they are out of employment, if they do not have credit at their little groceries, we know that they and their families are in distress. That is the situation with these men.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, does the Senator want me to answer him?

Mr. POMERENE. I intended to put that as a question.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am ready to answer it at any time.

Mr. POMERENE. Very well; I shall be very glad to have the Senator answer it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, many of the mills have closed down. Why? I think the Senator from Ohio understands that matter about as well as I do. We put wages up—and when I say “we” I mean the Government—so enormously above what the American people could possibly stand that there must come a reaction. As the wages went up during our war, the Senator knows as well as I do that efficiency went down. Now, you can not get over that situation in a day.

Mr. POMERENE. And, Mr. President, that was true on the farm as well as in the factory.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly it was. The farmer suffered from that—

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a moment; let me finish. The farmer suffered from that as well as anyone else. Now, I say, you can not mend that in a day. We went on immediately after the war demanding and receiving the same wage, and with little change in efficiency. Efficiency began to go up only to the extent that mills began to close, and people were fearful of losing their jobs. The result of it all was that you sent the price of every commodity up to such an extent that you depleted the public pocket-book. Never was there a time when the retailers made such enormous profits; never was there a time when the manufacturers themselves made such enormous profits; and as long as the high wages continued, and nearly everyone could get work at those high wages, you could continue the big prices. We were living on credit and a day of payment was inevitable. When the slump came it came all at once. We all had our pocketbooks emptied about the same time, and we all stopped buying.

Then the price of everything necessarily tumbled. People are not willing to go to work at the old price and with the old efficiency. They are not willing to labor for a price for which you can afford to hire them.

I want you to go and try to hire one of those men to-day whom you say you are feeding for a price that you can afford to pay him. What is his answer? “No.” I want you to go to some of the women and girls in those families, and say that your family is sick, your wife can not do the work, and you want to get some one to help her. Will you get anyone? No. Why? Because the wage she will demand will be beyond your ability to pay. Only the rich can afford to have domestic help to-day. These people will not do that kind of work. You could not get that character of service if you were to pay \$50 a month, and board amounting to another \$50, making an equivalent of \$100 a month. These people can get work, in my opinion, if they will consent to work for what the manufacturer can afford to pay and sell his goods for what the public can afford to pay for the goods.

We have all got to come down to bottom rock again. It does not make much difference which one comes down first. I think we had better all come down together, and go to work to produce goods for what the goods will sell for in the market, and that would start every wheel of industry to moving.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I agree with the last statement made by the Senator, to the effect that we should all come down together; but while we are coming down we ought not to make food products higher in price.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the food product—I am speaking now of bread—is the cheapest thing in the United States to-day, then it ought to be brought up to a price where the producer can live; and the Senator knows as well as I do that, measured by the amount of energy that produces a bushel of wheat or a barrel of flour, these two are the cheapest things in the United States to-day.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.



Mr. STANLEY. I understood the Senator from North Dakota to say that the Government had put up wages, and I understood the Senator from Ohio to concur. I was a little surprised—

Mr. POMERENE. Not in the statement that the Government put up the wages. I concurred in the statement that all should come down together.

Mr. STANLEY. I assumed as much.

Mr. POMERENE. Why, certainly.

Mr. STANLEY. I was a little surprised that my colleague from Ohio should get away from the proposition that supply and demand had something to do with the price of labor.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, Mr. President, we are not blind. All of us can remember when all of these buildings around the Capitol were going up during the war. The Senator knows the kind of labor that was performed there. The Senator can not be blind to the reports that have been made by the investigating committees in the case of all the war activities, showing the slacking everywhere; and every time a strike was threatened the Government surrendered. The administration surrendered. It was not necessary for it to surrender. It advised the surrender; it yielded to being held up by the profiteers—in the first instance by the manufacturing profiteers, and then it yielded to the profiteers from the labor basis, and between the two the poor old Government was ground.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota further yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. STANLEY. If the high wages paid recently were the result of the fiat of law, why not get away from all this trouble by simply passing another law and setting a high-wage scale? If we did it then we can do it now. If it was the result of law and not supply and demand, there is the same force behind the law now that there was then. If supply and demand have nothing to do with it, we can remedy the evil by an act of Congress.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, did supply and demand fix the price of wheat, or did the Government fix it? The Government was able to get around the law of supply and demand whenever it came to what the farmer produced. Wheat would have been at least \$5 a bushel during the war, but the Government stepped in and said that it should not be above \$2.21. It allowed everything that the farmer buys to increase from two to ten times, but it held the farmer down with the strong arm of Government and compelled him to produce, with labor that cost him from \$6 to \$10 a day, a bushel of wheat for \$2.21 at the terminals, and very much less than that upon the farm.

Oh, Mr. President, the same Government that sent the boys into the trenches and into the fire of hell for \$30 a month and compelled them to go there, the same Government that fixed the price of a barrel of flour and a bushel of wheat, had the power to fix the prices of commodities, and, above all, it had the power, when it was paying \$6 and \$8 and \$10 a day, to say to every man, "Give the Government in this day of dire distress an honest day's work." It did not do it. It did not try to do it.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota further yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. STANLEY. If the Government had not touched the price of wheat, I understand the Senator to say that it would have gone to \$5 a bushel.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STANLEY. What would have caused it to reach that dizzy height?

Mr. McCUMBER. The law of supply and demand. All the countries of the world were jumping over each other to get the grain. They needed it. Those foreign countries paid for munitions probably ten times what they cost. They had to have food for their soldiers, as well as munitions.

Mr. STANLEY. As I understand the Senator, then, the law of supply and demand during the war operated on wheat, or would have operated on it if it could—

Mr. McCUMBER. Just the same as on other things.

Mr. STANLEY. But it did not operate on wages. I thought the Senator said the Government raised the wages.

Mr. McCUMBER. I said the Government yielded to every strike where ships were being produced for the support of the Government and where munitions were being produced for the support of the Government.

The Government yielded to every demand, no matter whether there was justification or not. A strike would be inaugurated one day, and immediately after the administration granted the

increase demanded the same people would strike the next day, and the price would be raised and raised and raised again; and, as I say, just as prices went up efficiency went down.

During the war, when we were needing ships and needing them badly, when the peril of the U-boat threatened to destroy our cause and the cause of our Allies, I brought to the attention of the Senate the case of a gang of riveters who had been paid by the piece before the war and had averaged 400 rivets a day. The piecework system was discontinued, and they were paid nearly \$14 a day each, and immediately the production of each gang dropped to an average of 51 rivets a day, or only one-eighth of what had been previously accomplished, and the average in the United States was only forty-odd per cent of the prewar average. The Government did not have to submit to that situation, and it would not have submitted to it if the farmer had said, "I demand \$5 a bushel for my wheat."

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, I heartily sympathize with the distress of the farmer and with all the Senator has so eloquently said concerning his necessities. But my sympathies are broader than that, and I do not believe the high cost of living or high wages are all due to extortion and disloyalty and unwarranted strikes by every man who was not working on a farm at the time of the country's greatest peril. I believe the man with the hoe and the man behind the hammer, the man behind the plow, and the man behind the plane, that labor everywhere, loyal and true, did magnificently during that war, and in its patience and its love of the flag rivaled the gallantry of the boys in the trenches.

Mr. McCUMBER. And the boys in the trenches are now demanding a bonus to equalize the enormous wages paid to the men who were working here. I say the amounts paid were entirely out of proportion to the services rendered. Heaven knows we want good prices for labor; then we want an honest day's work done. We did not get it, as a rule, during the war. There is no use of anyone saying we did, because you can not deny the overwhelming testimony found in the records of all of the investigations. Why was it? I am not blaming those employed in production and construction so much as I am blaming the Government for its abominable system of cost plus, under which it gave a premium to idleness and a premium for padding the rolls; and they were padded and a premium was paid contractors for idleness.

Go through the record of any of the projects for war purposes and you will find the same condition practically everywhere. Let us be honest with each other, both as to the laboring man and as to the capitalist. The administration said to the capitalist, "You pay for your material anything that is demanded; you pay for labor anything that is demanded, and then we will pay you a bonus of 10 per cent upon the cost of anything you turn over to the Government." In other words, "The more you make it cost the Government, the more you get out of it." And they made it cost the Government an enormous amount.

I charge it to the Government's inefficiency. You may place the blame where you will. The result is exactly the same; the poor old United States was bled white, and we will have to levy taxes to the very limit for the next 25 or 50 years to pay for the wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4746.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], who made the pending motion, was forced to leave the Chamber to go to the Judiciary Committee. That motion was made at 2 o'clock, about two hours ago, and all of the intervening time, except about two or three minutes, has been occupied by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], one of the proponents of the so-called emergency tariff bill, who is now criticizing those who are opposed to this legislation.

I do not know why he should blame those who do not agree with him in the effort to increase the cost of living in this country for occupying some time in a discussion of this matter, and also in the discussion of other pieces of legislation which are called up in the Senate. If there could be statistics made of the time that has been consumed by those who are in favor of this so-called emergency tariff legislation and those who are opposed to it, since the bill was reported from the Finance Committee, I think they would show that the proponents of the emergency tariff legislation have consumed more time of the Senate than those who oppose it. They discussed fully those measures; and the so-called emergency tariff bill, which proposes to place additional burdens upon the consuming masses, has not been discussed by a single proponent of the legislation

until to-day, and that was in the two-hour speech of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

The packer bill, which was passed yesterday, was legitimately debated for some hours and some days, I might say. It was an important piece of legislation. Those who believed in it, who helped to frame it, who advocated it upon the floor of the Senate, believed, and justly so, that the five big packers had reached that stage in their life where they controlled such a large percentage of certain products in the live-stock business, and in other industries, that it had become such a giant in strength it should be restricted now before it should give a death blow in its further dealings.

I have no fault to find with those who voted against the packer legislation. If there ever was a piece of legislation which came upon the floor of the Senate about which there might be an honest difference of opinion, it was that legislation. I know how the sympathies and the views of men have been formed against commissions because of their regulatory requirements and the manner in which they have conducted various functions of the Government during the last few years. I am of the opinion that those Senators who saw fit in practically every instance to vote against the so-called packer legislation on yesterday did it not because they did not believe that the five big packers should be controlled and should be regulated and should be restricted further, but because of the provisions in the bill touching the commission. But those who believed in that legislation believed in it because they saw the dangers which lurked in the fact that five concerns controlled practically 60 per cent of the leather in the United States—and I may be wrong as to my figures, but they were quite large, as I recall; controlled between 60 and 70 per cent of all the live stock that is butchered which enters into interstate commerce in the United States; controlled a very large percentage of the eggs and poultry and cheese and mutton, those things which go upon the breakfast tables in this country. They thought the packers should be regulated, and that such regulation might in a way reduce the high cost of living, against which orators used their eloquence and inveighed during the last campaign.

After listening to the speech of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota a few moments ago, when he talked about the laboring man getting such high wages, and how he desired to see flour lifted a little bit in price, and wheat raised higher, and wages lowered, I was not surprised when I recalled that on yesterday a good part of the time of the debate was consumed by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, who now finds fault with some of us opposing this bill and expressing our opposition for a few moments upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, we were under the five-minute rule when I spoke yesterday; consequently I could not speak over five minutes.

Mr. HARRISON. It seemed to me quite a long time.

Mr. McCUMBER. If that was a good deal of the time, I do not know how the Senator makes his computation.

Mr. HARRISON. I was just mistaken. It seemed to me quite a long time. Take the other piece of legislation which has been debated here for a week, the minimum wage bill, which is fathered by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], a most worthy measure, legitimately debated upon the floor of the Senate.

If the Government of the United States can not fix a minimum wage for its employees, how can we expect the gigantic corporations of the country, which employ men by the thousands and tens of thousands, to have a minimum wage fixed for them? Yet, because some of us think that that is an important piece of legislation, that it should be discussed fully upon the floor of the Senate, though much of the time spent in the debate be taken up by the proponents of this so-called emergency tariff legislation, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota finds fault.

So there are many pieces of legislation now upon the calendar of the Senate which should be taken up for consideration, which need to be debated. There is the measure which was pending during the morning hour, championed by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I have such faith in his good judgment, I have such respect for his splendid patriotism, I like the man so much as a man, and am willing to follow him in so many things, especially when it comes down to dealing with the landlords and tenants of the District of Columbia, that I know it must be a good piece of legislation; and may I say to the Senate that a Senator here feels that he can take time away from the consideration of questions touching his own constituents and his own State and deal with questions of moment and of interest to the District of Columbia.

When I see the name of the distinguished Senator from Idaho attached to that piece of legislation and realize the many great

complicated questions, in the study and solution of which his time is taken up, I know that the Senate should give some of its time to the consideration of that bill. I say that notwithstanding the fact that we recently gave so much attention to a bill proposing disarmament, that received the sanction of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and when it was placed on the calendar I read in the papers that a distinguished ex-Secretary of State, a former United States Senator, asked that it be put off and not considered until the new President takes his seat and can confer with this great ex-Secretary of State upon the proposed legislation.

To the distinguished Senator from North Dakota with reference to this piece of legislation, of which he is such an advocate, and which he says is of so much interest to the wheat growers along the Canadian border, and which he does not say, but which I say, is of so much interest to the five great packers, and which he does not say, but which I say, is of so much interest to the consumers of the country, who have been burdened with the high cost of living for some time to such an extent that they can hardly make ends meet, I would suggest that it might be well, especially in view of the promise made by the Republican Party in the recent campaign touching the high cost of living, to postpone its consideration and give the new President an opportunity to confer with the ex-Secretary of State upon the future policy with reference to the subject matter of that bill.

I have read the Republican campaign textbook of 1910. Some Senators who have been here a long, long time were here then and will remember that that campaign was fought out upon the proposition of the high cost of living. The Democrats charged the Republican Party with the increased or high cost of living, and they defended it and said that the high protective tariff had nothing to do with it. On the floor of the Senate and from every stump in the country Republican spellbinders tried to free themselves of responsibility in connection with the high cost of living in 1910. In that campaign a textbook was issued, from which I might read paragraph after paragraph in which the Republican Party said that the increased price of foodstuffs could not be laid at the door of the protective tariff which they had placed upon the statute books. I shall read, before the debate is concluded, a report signed by certain Senators, members of a committee appointed by the then Vice President, upon a resolution which was presented by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I think, asking for an investigation into the high cost of living. On that committee the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] sat, and he, with the Senator from Massachusetts and others, signed the report. I wish to read just one paragraph from the report. The Senator from North Dakota will remember it. Here is what the Senator and other Republican Senators said in that report to the Senate of the United States:

The tariff seems to have been no material factor in causing the advance in prices during the past decade. The greatest advances have been made in commodities upon which the tariff has little or no effect, and the absolute removal of the tariff on many of these commodities could not have afforded relief at the present time, for the reason that the prices of these commodities, with a few exceptions, were as high or higher in other countries than in the United States.

So when it suits the Senator from North Dakota and suits his party in a campaign when they are charged with the responsibility for the high cost of living, and it is placed at their doors because of a high protective tariff, they say the tariff had nothing to do with it. In my humble opinion, the tariff of 40 cents a bushel on wheat, as provided in the pending bill, will have nothing to do with the price of wheat, for the very reason that was stated by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

It has been stated by Republican Senators in Congress and Republican leaders for generations that where there is produced in the country a surplus of exports over imports, as in this case, the tariff does not affect the price. It is a sham; it is a pretense. The price of wheat, in my humble opinion, is fixed in Liverpool, England.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. The Senator from Mississippi fails to catch the double purpose of the Senator from North Dakota. He proposes, as I understand, first to raise the price of wheat 40 cents a bushel by the imposition of a tariff, and, secondly, to prevent the importation of Canadian wheat into this country, notwithstanding the fact that wheat here after the bill is passed will bring about 65 cents more per bushel than wheat does in Canada. It is a double purpose that the Senator is going to subserve.



Mr. HARRISON. Absolutely. Of course, it is a sham and a pretense. It is the most specious piece of political hypocrisy ever presented to the United States Senate. It is merely for the purpose of fooling some farmers out West into the belief that they will get more for their wheat in the event the proposition goes through. But if they could get more for their wheat we can not get away from the proposition that somebody pays the bill, and who is it that pays the bill if it is not the consumers of the country, the people who eat bread?

Mr. STANLEY. I understand the principal reason, or one of the reasons given, for the imposition of the tariff is to prevent the importation of Canadian wheat. If the imposition of the duty raises the price of American wheat, I wish to ask the Senator from Mississippi how that is going to stop the flow of Canadian importation?

Mr. HARRISON. It can not do it.

A man with whom I served in the House, a very distinguished Republican who lives not far from the Canadian border, made a speech April 18, 1911, touching the question of a tariff on farm products. I desire to read an extract from that speech:

Again we find the inspired by cash and patriotism journals and oracles contending that we are discriminating against the American farmer because we cut the Payne tariff rate on wheat from 25 cents per bushel to 12 cents. My answer to this charge is that the 25-cent rate nor the 15-cent rate has not in the past and will not in the future have anything whatever to do with the price of wheat in this country or in Canada. There is not a country in this world that can compete with us in the raising of wheat anyway, and the tariff has been but an idle recital on the statute book, without affording the farmer one grain of protection in sheaf, at the granary, the elevator, or the mill. It is charged that wheat is 10 cents higher on our side than on the Canadian side. That is true partially. Both crops are controlled largely, if not absolutely, by the price at Liverpool, and in some cases from local conditions, usually transportation facilities, there are variances of 10 or more cents per bushel. It is, however, true that wheat in Winnipeg is higher than in the States for more than one-third of the year. I submit the prices of wheat often vary this much within a single State, and the figures do not prove that generally such is the case, and the safe prediction to make is that, the conditions being practically the same, the price of the land and labor being practically the same, both crops being controlled by the Liverpool market, the prices are not essentially different. This, of course, is not a universal rule, for local conditions vary the prices; also corners or hoarding oftentimes are causes for wheat going up or down suddenly.

To the end that we may not be mistaken about the matter, let us consult the statistics to ascertain just how much wheat we sent to Canada last year. In 1910 we sent to Canada to get the benefit of the outrageously low price referred to by those opposing this pact 2,111,370 bushels of wheat; and how interesting it is to observe that only 135,441 bushels of wheat came from Canada to get the benefit of our high prices, asserted to be caused by our tariff on wheat of 25 cents per bushel. The charge of the high-protection advocate will answer itself when these figures are analyzed. How refreshing it must be to the American farmer to know that he is no longer to be the cat's-paw that is to shield the greedy manufacturer while he grows rich from legislation and pleads for the farmer to stand by him because there has appeared on the statute book an idle recital of 25 cents a bushel on wheat. Such a proceeding is merely the selling to the farmers razors that will not shave. It is merely deceiving to get the farmer's help to further deceive the poor consumer of this country, who has hunger gnawing at his very stomach and whose poor cupboard is bare.

Those were the utterances of the distinguished Republican Congressman who lives along the border. I could read from other distinguished Republicans whose remarks I have here, but I shall not take up the time of the Senate this afternoon. I might be charged with filibustering if I should do so, and yet I have occupied less time since the bill was introduced than perhaps any Senator on the floor. So I pass from that, believing that the farmers have been fooled too much and too long, that the bill will not help them a particle, and where if we should help one of them we would hurt 199 consumers in the country.

I do not mind Republican Senators fooling the farmers in their respective localities, but I do not very much relish their coming over into our precincts and trying to fool some of our farmers. The Republicans have gone down into my State and for the first time are trying to hoodwink the cotton farmer there. It is smart; it is an adroit piece of work; but I lift up my voice against it. I do not want the farmers in my section of the country—the cotton farmers or any other farmers—to ever get it into their heads that a tariff upon wheat or upon cotton or upon any other similar product will ever help them, for I know that it will not. If it should I am that much against the principle of levying tribute against many in order to help a few that I would still continue to oppose it.

The pending bill is either intended to place a greater burden upon the consumer or to levy tariff taxes in order to protect the farmer. If an extension of tariff taxes will help the farmers, just that much will it hurt those who must necessarily buy from the farmers.

Before I proceed to analyze the bill I desire to say that I hold in my hand the Republican campaign textbook for 1920, about half of which is taken up by a discussion of the high cost

of living, criticizing the present administration for the high cost of living, and stating that the Republicans propose to remedy it when they get in. The other half of that textbook is composed of unwarranted, inexcusable, unjustifiable criticisms of the administration; but as the days pass by and the sunlight of truth shines forth the people will see the hypocrisy of the Republican pretensions. You promised them that you were going to reduce prices, and yet the bill now receiving the attention of the Senate and which Senators on the other side are clamoring to press down our throats and down the throats of the American people is one that is intended either to fool and deceive the farmers or to add to the high cost of living in this country.

Here [exhibiting] is a campaign document issued by the speakers' bureau of the Republican national committee during the campaign. It is labeled "Speakers' Series No. 1." It was put at the head of all the rest; it was made the most important document that should be issued in the form of a campaign pamphlet and it was headed "The High Cost of Living." It was not printed in small type, either; it was so printed as to be attractive, so that when as it was passed around by your campaign messengers people would ask, "What is it?" The reply would be, "It is a document on 'The High Cost of Living.'" The Republican Party in that pamphlet states it is going to remove some of the burdens of taxation and prevent the extortion incident to the high cost of living which the Democratic Party is responsible for having perpetrated on the people. Read it; it will be interesting." Of course the little housewife and her husband are interested. They are living or trying to live on small wages and striving to make ends meet, taking the pay check and going down on Saturday night and seeing the proceeds eaten up before they have half of the commodities which they need for the coming week. So that pamphlet was attractive to them; they called for it. I have no doubt that the speakers' bureau of the Republican national committee had to have a reprint and yet another reprint of this pamphlet called "The High Cost of Living." I shall not read it; it may be necessary before the debate is over to do so; but for the present I shall merely call it to the attention of Senators. No doubt the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] saw it, although it may be that out of courtesy to his constituents, who are clamoring for a higher tariff on foodstuffs, the campaign committee kept it out of his State; but it went from one end of the country to the other.

That was not the only pamphlet which Republicans issued touching the high cost of commodities. The speakers' bureau of the Republican national committee issued pamphlet No. 3 in most attractive form, with the title printed in larger letters than in the case of the "High Cost of Living" pamphlet and with a big question mark under the title. I have no doubt that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota saw the pamphlet. I have not the slightest doubt that the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the economist of the Senate, he who sometimes exercises the power of his office to keep down the expenses of the Government by refusing Senators the privilege of placing speeches or pamphlets or documents into the Record—I doubt not that he gave no evidence of a desire of economy on the part of the Republican Party in making demand after demand in his recent campaign in Utah that he sent thousands on thousands of copies of the pamphlet entitled, "Why 25 Cent Sugar?" It may be that because of the distribution in Utah and in other States of the Union of the pamphlet, "Why 25 Cent Sugar," and the pamphlet entitled, "The High Cost of Living," the Republican Party were enabled to get such large majorities in the recent election.

However, what I am contending is that the Republicans should not fool their constituents so soon after the election.

If you have led them to believe by speeches and pamphlets and propaganda that the Democratic Party had placed a heavy burden upon their backs and was responsible for the high cost of living, then you ought to meet your promises; you ought to redeem your pledges. If you are not going to do that, you should not begin at such an early day throwing those promises and pledges to the winds and disregarding them, as you are doing in the bill now pending before the Senate. You promised to reduce the cost of living, and yet in this bill here is the way you propose to do it: You start off with cherries; you do not want the people even to have cherries, although I know they do not now need cherries for some purposes for which they formerly used them. Apples! You do not want any apples imported into this country. Then we come down to the hides of cattle and find that you desire to prevent hides coming in. Why, Mr. President, Senators who are proposing this legislation evidently are not the fathers of families; evidently they

have not been obliged to visit the stores in the past two or three years and purchase numerous pairs of children's shoes, six or seven pairs a year for each child, costing \$6, \$7, \$8, and sometimes as high as \$12 a pair, for those Senators, who promised the people to reduce the cost of living, would impose a tariff, a tax, on every person in this country who has to buy a pair of shoes.

I asked a retailer some days ago what was the present price of shoes. I have here some of the prices which he quoted. They are the prices to-day, after the retailers have unloaded, after "sales" have been held, and when the stocks on hand are small. Men's shoes, \$7, \$10, \$12, and \$15 a pair. In October the prices were \$10, \$12, and \$18. The October prices are those which the Republicans in the Senate at least, and evidently those in the House, wish to retain and compel all the people in this country to pay. I repeat, in October the prices were \$10, \$12, and \$18, whereas now they have gone down to \$8, \$10, and \$15. That reduction has taken place within a few months; but now it appears the Republicans want to lift the price back, and the best method they can think of to accomplish that result is to pass a piece of legislation which will put a 15 per cent ad valorem duty on the hides of cattle.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. When the Senator asked the retail merchant the price of shoes, did he also ask him how much an ad valorem duty of 15 per cent on leather would add to the price of shoes?

Mr. HARRISON. I did not ask him that.

Mr. McCUMBER. It will add between 4½ and 5 cents.

Mr. HARRISON. Between 4½ and 5 cents on a pair of shoes?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota and the distinguished Senator from Utah are such experts that I will not take issue with them as to that, because I have not figured it out; I could not figure it out if I wanted to, and I doubt if they have figured it out correctly; but I know that what they now propose to do is to add a further burden on the people who have to buy shoes.

I am not surprised at that, especially when I heard the distinguished Senator from North Dakota a few moments ago, in referring to wheat, say that to place the proposed tariff on wheat would not make the laboring man now receiving a certain wage work over one-fourth of a day longer. That may be true, but a fourth of a day longer for every workingman in this country is a pretty hard burden, and I am not willing with my vote to say that every workingman in this country who eats biscuits and bread and needs flour will have to work a fourth of a day longer in order to pay tribute to a few farmers along the Canadian border.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I know the Senator wants to be accurate. The Senator did not understand me to say a fourth of a day longer every day, but that it would be the equivalent of the earnings of a fourth of one day for one year, which is quite a difference.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, for one year? Well, I am not willing to go even that far with the Senator. I am glad, though, that the Senator has got it down to one-fourth of a day a year now.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator must remember that I was speaking of a barrel of flour a year, which is the average consumption; and it would require, at the present wage of a carpenter, one-fourth of one day's work during a year, provided it was all tacked to the barrel of flour.

Mr. HARRISON. So we are agreed, by admission from the Senators from Utah and North Dakota, that on every pair of shoes it will increase the price 4½ or 5½ cents, and that it will make the wage earner work a fourth of a day a year longer.

Let us go down the line. You have tobacco here. You want to stop the poor old fellow from smoking and chewing. I knew there were some fanatics in the country who were trying to start that propaganda, but I did not know that the Senators from Utah and North Dakota were giving impetus to that movement.

I go down the list.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if the Senator wants the genesis of any of these items in the bill on tobacco and hides, I think he will have to go to his own side of the Chamber.

Mr. HARRISON. I thought before this debate was over that the Senator from North Dakota and other Senators on that side would want to excuse themselves from the responsibility.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I am not excusing myself. I think the Senator who wanted the addition made on hides was the

Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES]. I think he offered that particular amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. But the Senator voted for it.

Mr. McCUMBER. And the increases on tobacco were made as the result of petitions from the localities where tobacco is raised, and it is raised both north and south of the line. We saw the good reasons for it, and therefore we adopted their rates.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOODING in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not able to say, because I do not recollect, who proposed the provision in the bill relating to hides; but I do know, Mr. President, that so far as the action of the committee was concerned, the duty laid upon tobacco in this bill came as the result of a suggestion from the Senator from Connecticut. It applies only to the particular kind of tobacco which is raised in Connecticut. If there is any tobacco in this country that is covered by the provisions of the bill outside of that grown in Connecticut, I do not know of it. At least, so far as the Finance Committee's consideration of this matter is concerned, it was confined to a discussion of the requirements and demands of the tobacco growers in Connecticut, where they grow under cover a tobacco suited almost entirely and used almost entirely for wrappers. It was suggested that this tobacco needed an enormous increase in the tariff already upon it, the tariff on it already being about \$2.85 a pound, as I recall, and it was suggested that that duty ought to be increased an additional dollar a pound. Nobody representing the great tobacco interests of this country, especially of the South, suggested that the tobacco grown in that section needed any protection, or that any amount of duty imposed upon tobacco of that character would in the slightest degree affect the domestic market price of that tobacco.

Tobacco is grown chiefly in the South. More than half of all the tobacco of this country is grown in the South, and I have never yet met a southern man who believed that a tariff upon tobacco would be worth one cent to him. I have never heard of their coming to Congress and asking for the imposition of any duty upon the character of tobacco which they grow. So the suggestion that the request for the duty imposed upon tobacco in this bill came from this side of the Chamber, so far as my knowledge goes, is without the slightest foundation whatever.

Mr. HARRISON. We have got it down now to a point where neither side wants to be responsible for certain items in this bill. I am glad this side is not responsible for them, and this side will not be responsible for the passage of the bill should it pass; but it is rather unfair to say that we are unnecessarily debating a piece of legislation of this importance, because during all the time it has been before the Senate there has not yet been four hours—there has not been two hours and a half—of discussion of it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think it perfectly fair to the Senator and to those on this side of the Chamber to say that we expect that all the time that is necessary for a proper discussion of this measure will be granted, and granted cheerfully, and will be taken in the same cheerful manner. I do not think I stated anything to-day about any filibuster. I did believe that Senators should try to dispose of the subject as soon as they had given it full and fair consideration. I have asked no more. But when the Senator from Mississippi some time ago introduced an amendment consisting of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which if we read from early morning until late at night during the entire session we would not have read half-way through, I know the Senator will excuse me if I thought there was in that amendment a mild suggestion of a proposed filibuster; and I gathered the idea, just a little, that possibly the Senator wanted to consume time. Otherwise, I could not see any use of introducing an amendment to this bill the Revised Statutes of the United States, which would require about three months, I think, merely to read in the ordinary number of hours. I know now, however, that the Senator does not intend anything of that kind, and does not seriously propose to have read the Revised Statutes of the United States; so let us both forget any suggestion or intimation or suspicion that there is any filibuster, and let us try to get through with this bill as soon as we can.

Mr. HARRISON. Let us never hear the word "filibuster" again.



I am glad that the Senator has brought up some of the amendments I have offered to this bill. I think if there is an important matter that is pending before the Senate it is the codification of the laws of the United States. I recall, I think in the Sixty-third Congress, when after working for weeks and weeks and weeks in the House we finally brought out a bill there, and then it came to the Senate, and it died. That bill was brought out by a distinguished Republican Member of the House, Congressman LITTLE, of Kansas, who has given great and earnest and continued thought to the codification of the laws of the United States. It was passed in the House and is pending over here in the Senate, and if the Senate can get to it before the 4th of March, it is a piece of legislation that should be passed, and I thought this would be one of the best ways to pass that legislation.

The Senator forgets, too, that I offered two or three other amendments. I am sorry that the Finance Committee, which is controlled by the Senator's party, did not tack those amendments on to this bill. It is legislation that is worthy, it is just, it commends itself to very patriotic and wise Senator here.

No one could find fault with those amendments. In one of them I wanted really to do something that would be worth while for the farmers of the country, since the farm-loan bank system can not operate because of this case that is pending in the Supreme Court. I might say in passing that I hope, and sincerely hope, and I know I voice the wish of every Senator and every man who is interested in the farm-loan bank system, that a decision will be forthcoming very soon on that important piece of legislation, whether it is favorable to it or against it, so that we can do something toward it. I offered a very short amendment with the idea and in the hope that we might do something for the farmers who are caught in these abnormal times, in the stress of the present-day conditions, with prices declining in some instances; that we might create some medium whereby they might borrow money for short terms—six months—secured by agricultural products, wheat elevator receipts or cotton-warehouse receipts. It was in the hope that we could do something for these men who really need some money now that I offered that amendment; but I find that it received no sympathy upon the part of the Republican majority of the Senate. They turned me down in that effort really to do something for these farmers.

Another amendment that I proposed was to do something for the western people in the way of irrigation, and the other was to do something for the soldiers. There was passed through the House some eight months ago a soldiers' bonus bill. Since that time it has been before the Finance Committee of the Senate, controlled by the Senators with whom I have been debating this question. I wanted to get it out of that committee; but the Republican majority of the Finance Committee turned me down on that amendment. I proposed the bill which was passed by the House and sent to the Senate as an amendment to this legislation to do something for these soldiers, and yet I find myself criticized for doing that.

We are almost together. We both agree now that there is no filibustering about this proposition; that the bill is of such moment that it should be debated fully; and I hope it will be. I do not want to see the big appropriation bills killed. Nearly two months of this session have passed and only about 35 days remain before the session will close. So far we have passed only one of the great supply bills. The first thing we know the calendar will be clogged and we will not be able to give those bills the degree of consideration they warrant and deserve. So, while I am in hopes that we can fully discuss this bill, I fear very much, because of the state of the calendar and the importance of those bills, that we shall not get as much time to discuss this bill as it deserves.

But we will have to work together about it. We will have to cooperate with one another and do the very best we can under the circumstances.

Is the Senate to recess or adjourn this afternoon? The Senator from Montana, who made the motion now before the Senate, is not in the Chamber.

Mr. McCUMBER. The usual time for adjournment is about 5 o'clock, and I would like to have the Senate go on for another 15 minutes. But the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], who wishes to be present during the debate, said he would like to have the Senate adjourn at 10 minutes before 5 to-day on account of work he has to do, and if the Senator from Mississippi does not wish to speak any longer now we might as well adjourn at this time. It would be a difference of only five minutes, anyway.

Mr. HARRISON. Very well.

#### SIZE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before we adjourn I desire to put in the RECORD the figures as to the present strength and expenditures on account of the armies of Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and Germany, as given me by the librarian.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Table showing the relative size of the military establishments of Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and Germany, and the expenditures with regard to same.*

[Data compiled from Statesman's Year Book, 1919, 1920; World Almanac, 1921; New York Herald, Oct. 3, 1920, p. 17; Current History, December, 1920, pp. 373-379; National Service, August, 1920, p. 124; London Economist, Mar. 20, 1920, p. 643.]

Country.	Present strength.	Expenditures, 1919-20.	Estimated expenditure, 1920-21.
Great Britain.....	348,000	\$500,000,000	\$125,000,000
France.....	378,000	2,735,000,000	17,000,000,000
Italy.....	250,000	391,503,923	.....
Japan.....	600,000	\$205,000,000	\$200,000,000
Germany.....	100,000	.....	1,500,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Francs.

<sup>2</sup> Lira.

<sup>3</sup> Marks.

#### UNITED STATES FORCES IN GERMANY.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I also desire to make a statement in reference to the testimony of the Secretary of War a few days ago before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate as to the amount of the cost of our forces in Germany. The total cost of our forces in Germany up to date is the sum of \$263,628,320. Up to September 30, 1920, Germany had paid \$35,573,658, leaving a balance due the United States of \$228,054,662. The average cost to Germany, when she pays it, will be \$71,218 per day.

I put these figures in the RECORD for the purpose of calling attention to them, and especially to call attention to the very large amount which Germany apparently still owes us.

There was a good deal of doubt in the testimony which was adduced before our committee, and I have the figures up to September 30, 1920. Since that time an examination has been made, but up to date we have found no subsequent payments. If there have been any payments I will later give the amounts of such payments. At all events, the very stupendous sum of \$228,000,000 is due us by Germany to-day, and, so far as I know, no efforts are being made to procure the payment. I ask unanimous consent to put these figures in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total cost of United States forces in Germany up to Sept. 30, 1920.....	\$263, 628, 320
Amount paid United States by Germany up to Sept. 30, 1920.....	35, 573, 658
Leaving a balance due United States of.....	228, 054, 662
The average strength of the Army was—	
Officers.....	711
Enlisted men.....	14, 547
Total.....	15, 258
Average cost to Germany per day, \$71,218.	

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 26, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 25, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TILSON).

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, pastor of Calvary Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God accept our gratitude for every expression of Divine care manifested toward our beloved country. May Thy truth flood all of our hearts and nourish therein the roots of every good thing, that our purposes may be high, our vows noble, and all of our desires reaching out toward Thee. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## AERONAUTICS (S. DOC. NO. 358).

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, ordered printed, and with the accompanying documents referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress, a special report of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, in which the committee sets forth its views as to the value to the Nation of the air mail service of the Post Office Department, based on broad, general considerations of national interest and policy.

I concur in the opinions expressed by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and indorse its recommendation for the continuance of the Air Mail Service.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

24 January, 1921.

## AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15812, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. Hicks in the chair.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the item for general expenses, on page 7 of the bill, for the purpose of making a correction.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to return to page 7 of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Reserving the right to object, what is the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. The item to which I refer makes general appropriation of \$1,300,110 for salaries, special observations, telegraph and telephoning. I offered an amendment when that item was pending dividing the total amount into three items into which they had been previously divided for special observations, reports of telegraph and telephone and the amount was placed at \$600,080 instead of \$697,080. I desire to ask unanimous consent to return to correct the amount. It does not change the total.

Mr. GARD. It is intended to separate them into the different constituent elements?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, will this increase the present number of employees in the office?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it carries the same amount as last year less the employees that have been transferred out of the lump sum to the statutory roll.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment I offered on January 22, which appears on page 1901 of the RECORD, applying to page 7, line 23, that the amount of \$600,080, as stated in the amendment, may be changed to \$697,080, and that this amendment may be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk informs the Chair that in the official record it is correct. The Clerk reports that the amount is \$697,080.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was under the impression that the amendment was offered in that way, but it appears in the record as \$600,080. If the official record is correct, I withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The official record is evidently correct.

The Clerk read as follows:

## BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Chemistry: Chemist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; administrative assistant, \$2,500; 4 executive clerks at \$2,000 each; clerks—14 of class 4, 16 of class 3, 6 at \$1,440 each, 30 of class 2, 6 at \$1,300 each, 65 of class 1, 17 at \$1,020 each; machine operators—1 \$1,100, 2 at \$1,000 each; laboratory helpers—8 at \$1,200 each, 10 at \$1,020 each, 4 at \$960 each, 5 at \$900 each, 8 at \$840 each; laboratory helpers or laborers—6 at \$780 each, 27 at \$720 each, 15 at \$600 each; mechanics—1 \$2,280, 2 at \$1,800 each, 1 \$1,620, 2 at \$1,400 each, 3 at \$1,200 each, 1 \$1,020, 1 \$960; 2 student assistants at \$300 each; skilled laborers—1 \$1,050, 1 \$1,020, 1 \$900, 1 \$840; 2 messengers at \$840 each; messenger boys—1 \$720, 8 at \$600 each, 3 at \$540 each, 6 at \$480 each; 4 laborers at \$480 each; 13 charwomen at \$240 each; in all, \$330,690.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, in this paragraph for these services alone

the Committee on Appropriations has provided for 20 messengers. Yesterday, when I was protesting at the number of messengers still provided by this bill, the chairman of the subcommittee having in charge the matter stated that he would much prefer that the messengers do errands for these \$5,000 men in the employ of the various departments than to have those \$5,000 men run their own errands. Of course, that would be a business proposition. I then called the attention of the chairman to the fact that very few of these high-priced heads of bureaus did anything, let alone run errands; that it was very hard to find them in their offices on any occasion. You go to look them up on a business matter and they would be reported at lunch. Go back two hours later and they are still at lunch and have not come back. Along that line the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] stated yesterday that on one occasion he found six out of seven bureau chiefs absent from their offices.

Mr. MAGEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MAGEE. I want to say that I have not had that experience.

Mr. BLANTON. I suppose the gentleman has not been at these offices as much as the gentleman from Indiana and myself. Perhaps the gentleman has had his clerks do the work at the departments. Much of that I do myself, and if the gentleman will go around the bureaus himself he will find many of them absent. I had a supervisor down there tell me that the reason they did not require the men and the women to pay much attention to the work was because the heads above them did not do anything. It interferes with the morale of the whole department. But, be that as it may, they do not need 574 messengers in this one department.

I call attention to this question because I want my colleagues to remember that if you want to get rid of the messenger service that is needless, unnecessary, a surplus, that is a waste purely of Government money, I am going to give you an opportunity to do it, because I am going to offer a motion to recommit that will propose to cut out 500 messengers from this service.

If you want to cut down the pay roll, if you want to save this money for the people, you are going to have an opportunity to vote for that motion to recommit; and I want to tell you right now that if you think it is a matter that the people of the country are not concerned about, you are mistaken. I wish you could see the number of letters that I have received, after making one such fight for retrenchment, from people all over the country who are reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, who say, "BLANTON, they ought to be cut off, and I can not understand why your colleagues will not stay with you and vote with you on those matters." I wish you would come around to my office and see some of the letters from your own districts, and then you would be more concerned about it. It is a matter concerning which the people of the country are vitally interested, and I hope when I make the motion to recommit to cut 500 of these useless, idle, unnecessary messengers out of this one department some of you will stay with me and help me vote it out and save this money for the people.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Bureau of Soils: Soil physicist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$4,000; chief clerk, \$2,000; administrative assistant, \$2,100; executive assistant, \$2,000; clerks—4 of class 4, 3 of class 3, 6 of class 2, 1 \$1,260, 13 of class 1, 1 \$1,000; 2 soil cartographers at \$1,800 each; draftsman—1 \$1,600, 8 at \$1,200 each; soil bibliographer or draftsman, \$1,400; photographer, \$1,200; laboratory helpers—1 \$1,000, 3 at \$840 each; machinists—1 \$1,440, 1 \$1,380; machinist's helper, \$900; instrument maker, \$1,200; messenger, \$840; 2 messenger boys at \$480 each; messenger or laborer, \$660; laborers—3 at \$600 each, 1 \$300; charwoman or laborer, \$480; in all \$79,240.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I note that several of the bureau chiefs under the Agricultural Department receive a \$5,000 salary, while the Chief of the Bureau of Soils and others enumerated, as I look through the bill, receive but \$4,000. What is the idea of so classifying these salaries?

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, some of the bureaus are larger than others, and these salaries are all fixed by law. While I think it would be desirable to have a reclassification of the salaries of the bureau chiefs, this committee has no authority to make such a reclassification.

Mr. FESS. I would take it that the work of the Chief of the Bureau of Soils must be of a very high grade, yet the salary is not so large as the salary of other chiefs. I am not complaining about the salary, but I am asking purely for information. The Bureau of Chemistry, of course, requires a very high-grade man, but I should think that the Bureau of Soils would also require a high-grade man.

Mr. ANDERSON. The salary is fixed by law, and, as I stated, the committee had no authority to change it.



The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For exploration and investigation within the United States to determine possible sources of supply of potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers, \$86,840.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to make an inquiry as to the prospect under this item, so far as the evidence shows, of the development of potash, nitrates, and so on. Have we evidence that there is a supply of these elements within reach under proper development?

Mr. ANDERSON. There are several sources of possible supply of potash, some of which are being developed and some of which are not. There are various deposits of phosphate rock. One of the difficulties connected with that has been the presence of borax. During the war when we had very great need of potash much of this potash was sold with the borax in it, with very disastrous results. Since that time methods have been developed for eliminating the borax down to a point of safety, but something is still necessary to be done in that direction.

Then there are possibilities of securing potash from the by-products of the cement and blast furnaces, which are being developed, and part of the increase carried in this bill is for the purpose of developing potash from those sources.

Mr. FESS. Is that by-product promising in quantity?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes. Under normal conditions I think it would be clearly desirable and commercially possible to produce a very large quantity of potash from the cement furnaces, but of course the price of cement has been so high that there has been very little inducement to install the apparatus which is necessary to produce this potash from the furnaces.

Mr. FESS. Is there a source of supply of potash in the alkali fields of the West?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes; and that is the supply that I referred to with the borax in it.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, will the two gentlemen yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. KINKAID. I ask the pardon of the chairman of the committee for the suggestion that I shall make relative to the Nebraska potash, but it is my understanding that the borax which has been complained of was not found in potash produced in Nebraska, but in what came from a certain lake in California.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman is correct about that. It is the California.

Mr. KINKAID. It is due to the California product to say that a means has been found whereby the borax is eliminated and that product now gives good satisfaction.

I desire to say that thousands and thousands of tons have been produced in Nebraska from lakes, and thousands, even millions, of tons remain there now for production. It is potash of a very fine quality, too. The producers in Nebraska are now trying to solve the problem of freight rates by eliminating the raw material which has no value. In this way, if the process proves successful, the weight can be reduced 75 per cent below what it now is, and thus rail rates for the Nebraska product could successfully compete with ocean rates from Germany.

Mr. FESS. Then, in the judgment of the gentleman, it is commercially possible?

Mr. KINKAID. Certainly, when enabled to compete with the foreign potash. We have a good quality in the United States which can be produced abundantly, and if we can reduce the weight three-fourths and be accorded protection in proportion to the difference in labor cost a large industry can soon be developed which can successfully compete with importations from foreign countries.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is just the question of concentrating the fertilizer element so as to eliminate the part of the raw product which is not potash, thus reducing the weight on which they have to pay freight.

Mr. FESS. The expenditure here, then, is not purely experimental?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it is for demonstrations and for experiments, for the development of better machinery and better methods.

Mr. FESS. Is it under this authority that they have been experimenting out in the kelp fields?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; that is in the item at the bottom of page 47.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. Is this sum deemed adequate by the department for the investigation and demonstration contemplated by this provision?

Mr. ANDERSON. The department asked for a total of \$25,000 for recovering potash from cement plants and glass furnaces and an additional sum of \$35,000 for the development of processes of fixing the nitrates.

Mr. LANHAM. Their work will not be hampered or retarded by the amount that is granted?

Mr. ANDERSON. The committee did not allow the full amount, but I think the desirable portion of the work can be done under the amount which we allow.

Mr. LANHAM. I have been advised that in my State, for instance, there are some possible sources of potash that may be very valuable, and I wanted to be assured that the work would not be hampered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; those deposits are known to the department and were under consideration in connection with the item.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation of soils, in cooperation with other branches of the Department of Agriculture, other departments of the Government, State agricultural experiment stations, and other State institutions, and for indicating upon maps and plats, by coloring or otherwise, the results of such investigations, \$168,200.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to inquire of the gentleman in charge of the bill why this appropriation is reduced by \$10,000. When I first came here in 1912, \$166,000 was appropriated for soil surveys, and the amount was gradually increased to \$216,000 in 1918. But the appropriation has been reduced during the last two years and the committee now proposes a further reduction of \$10,000. I am not aware what the situation may be in the rest of the United States, but I know in the West further soil surveys are greatly needed. I presume that in other parts of the United States this work is not completed by any means. What is the idea of reducing this appropriation when so much work remains to be done?

Mr. ANDERSON. This is a character of work of which it is possible to do either a good deal or very little. It can be done at a fast rate or it can be done at a slow rate. It is just a question of the amount of money you want to spend on it at the time. There is no imperative need for it, and in view of the increases which we made in some of the other items in the bill, and in pursuance of the general policy which the committee adopted of finding money for the increases in the bill itself, and in view of the fact that the work could be slowed up without doing anybody any harm, because it is not necessary that this work should be done immediately, we thought the item could be cut \$10,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. If such surveys are not worth while, this appropriation should be discontinued entirely. I do not think anyone will dispute that an accurate and scientific soil survey is extremely valuable. Congress having adopted a policy of appropriating about \$200,000 a year, a small cut of \$10,000 will not make any difference to anybody except the bureau which is actually conducting the work.

I know that in my State there are several areas of agricultural land which should be surveyed, and I do not want to be told that the amount appropriated by Congress will not permit the bureau to do the work. All such surveys are cooperative in character, and I am sure this small reduction, which amounts to so little to the taxpayer, for a service which is important to the country, should not be made without at least a protest.

Mr. ANDERSON. The total amounts expended in the Government service are made up of small sums, and you can not practice any economy if you are going to pay no attention to either small increases or small decreases. And, as I said before, this is a work which is not imperative. It can be very readily slowed up at this time without affecting adversely either the organization or the country. Personally I felt it could be very much further reduced than it was, but the judgment of the committee, in the compromises that are normally effected, resulted in a cut of \$10,000, which I think is very reasonable under the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For examination of soils to aid in the classification of agricultural lands, in cooperation with other bureaus of the department and other departments of the Government, \$15,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The question of the wages paid to farm labor, of course, is now, and always has been, probably the most important item in agricultural production. I have some statistics that I found this morning in the Washington Herald, giving a very

comprehensive and rather brief result of the investigation of the Department of Agriculture on this question of wages paid to farm labor in the prewar and postwar periods, from 1913 to 1920. It contains a synopsis of the average wage scale, with board and without board, in the different geographical sections of the country, and I think it contains information that will be of value to the Members of the House. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that it may be incorporated in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to incorporate certain matter in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The following is the synopsis referred to:

POSTWAR WAGES FOR FARM LABOR EXCEED OLD SCALE—AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT FIGURES SHOW INCREASES RANGE TO 150 PER CENT.

[By the Washington Herald's economic expert.]

Everyone will agree that the farmers have suffered severely this year because of the high prices they had to pay during the growing season and finally through the big drop in the price of farm products in recent months. One of the causes for complaint from the agricultural States this summer was the excessive price for farm labor. The Department of Agriculture has published some figures on the wages of farm labor for a series of years. A portion of these figures, together with a percentage comparison with prewar years, is given in the following table:

Wages of male farm labor.

	Per month.			
	With board.		Without board.	
	Actual.	Relative to pre-war.	Actual.	Relative to pre-war.
	Per cent.		Per cent.	
1911-1913 (prewar average).....	\$20.79	100	\$29.55	100
1914.....	21.05	101	29.88	101
1915.....	21.26	102	30.15	102
1916.....	23.25	112	32.83	111
1917.....	28.87	139	40.43	137
1918.....	34.92	168	47.07	159
1919.....	39.82	192	56.29	191
1920.....	46.89	226	64.95	220

  

	Day labor with board.			
	At harvest.		Not at harvest.	
	Actual.	Relative to pre-war.	Actual.	Relative to pre-war.
	Per cent.		Per cent.	
1911-1913 (prewar average).....	\$1.53	100	\$1.13	100
1914.....	1.55	101	1.13	100
1915.....	1.56	102	1.13	100
1916.....	1.69	111	1.26	112
1917.....	2.08	136	1.56	138
1918.....	2.65	173	2.07	183
1919.....	3.15	206	2.45	217
1920.....	3.60	235	2.86	253

Before the war the average farm hand employed by the month cost \$20.79 and his board. In 1920 the farm hand employed under the same conditions received on the average \$46.89, or an increase of 126 per cent over the prewar price. Whether employed without board or by the day, the percentage increase has been nearly the same, ranging from 120 to 150 per cent above the prewar average.

Based on the prevailing prices for farm products during the first six months of this year, the farmers were fully justified in paying these wages. This is shown by the following figures on the price index of farm crops calculated from Department of Agriculture data:

Index of farm-crop prices.

AVERAGE 1911-1913, 100.		Index.
Prewar average.....		100.0
1914.....		100.9
1915.....		100.7
1916.....		123.5
1917.....		197.8
1918.....		211.7
1919.....		221.0
January, 1920.....		226.1
April, 1920.....		254.6
July, 1920.....		285.1
October, 1920.....		189.5
December, 1920 (approximate).....		126.9

In April of this year crop prices showed an advance of 154 per cent over the average for the prewar years. This was a considerably greater increase than the 125 or 130 per cent increase in labor cost. By July farm prices had advanced still further and reached a point 185 per cent above prewar. But since that time there has been an enormous drop. In October farm prices were less than 90 per cent above prewar, and in December they were only 27 per cent above that base.

Those farmers who could and did dispose of their crops immediately after harvest fared fairly well, but those who still have their crops on hand face a deficit in the year's operations.

Farm wages in different parts of the country are by no means equal. The following table shows the average wages in the principal geographical sections of the country:

Wages of male farm labor by geographical divisions.

Geographical division.	Wages per month, with board.			Wages per day at harvest, without board.		
	1910	1919	1920	1910	1919	1920
North Atlantic.....	\$21.65	\$42.18	\$51.92	\$2.08	\$3.86	\$4.68
South Atlantic.....	13.77	30.54	35.75	1.33	2.82	3.30
North Central east of Mississippi River.....	22.91	42.12	51.49	2.16	4.32	5.03
North Central west of Mississippi River.....	25.10	50.29	59.63	2.43	5.33	5.94
South Central.....	15.28	32.42	36.53	1.47	3.14	3.41
Far Western.....	32.69	62.96	73.21	2.52	4.67	5.39
Average for United States.....	19.21	39.82	46.89	1.82	3.83	4.35

Wages in the far Western States are more than double those in the South, where the low quality and relative abundance of Negro labor lowers the amount paid.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having taken the chair, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3944. An act to create a Federal live stock commission, to define its powers and duties, and to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to the provisions of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38) directing the method of counting the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States and declaring the result, had appointed Mr. LODGE and Mr. UNDERWOOD tellers on the part of the Senate.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the completion, operation, and maintenance of the Government kelp plant at Summerland, Calif., \$150,000: *Provided*, That the product obtained from such experimentation may be sold at a price to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the amount obtained from the sale thereof shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That at any time during the fiscal year 1922 or thereafter, when the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine that the interests of the Government will be subserved thereby, he is hereby authorized to appraise the buildings, machinery, marine equipment, kelp harvesters, boats, leasehold or contract rights, and all other property of whatever nature or kind appertaining to the experimental kelp potash plant of the Department of Agriculture situated at Summerland, Calif., and to sell the same at public or private sale, at such price or prices, on such terms, and in such manner as he may deem for the best interests of the Government, and in consummation thereof to execute such instruments of conveyance as may be requisite, the proceeds from such sale to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the following language in the paragraph which has just been read:

For the completion, operation, and maintenance of the Government kelp plant at Summerland, Calif., \$150,000: *Provided*, That the product obtained from such experimentation may be sold at a price to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the amount obtained from the sale thereof shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*—

If my point of order should be sustained, then that would leave in the paragraph that provision which provides for the sale of the plant. I make the point of order to the language that I have indicated, on the ground that it is an appropriation not authorized by law and is not the continuation of a public work. And I call the Chair's attention to the fact that when the Agricultural appropriation bill was up for consideration for the fiscal year 1920, in December, 1919, this same item was carried in the bill in the following language:

For investigation and demonstration within the United States to determine the best method of obtaining potash on a commercial scale, \$192,900, including the establishment and equipment of such plant or plants as may be necessary therefor.

Now, I made the point of order at that time, stating the same ground in substantiation thereof that I now make. Mr. WALSH, of Massachusetts, was in the chair, and after the matter had



been argued he rendered the following opinion sustaining the point of order.

The gentleman from Minnesota contends that this investigation and demonstration, a plant having already been established, is the continuation of a public work. The Chair does not think that the continuation of an investigation such as this is, a scientific investigation by a department, constitutes such a work in progress as may be denominated the continuation of a public work—

And so on. Now, if the Chair will observe by reading the proceedings at that time he will see that the point of order was sustained. And then the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] offered the provision again in the following language:

For the completion, operation, and maintenance of the Government kelp plant at Summerland, Calif., \$192,900.

Now, to that new language I did not make a point of order, not because I did not think it was subject to a point of order, but for the reason that during the discussion of the point of order at the time the item was up, it was brought out that it was the hope of the department to continue this experiment another year and to develop it in such a way as to show that kelp could be produced at a commercial profit, and that the plant could then be sold at a profit. Therefore, after that statement had been made, when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] again offered the item, I did not make the point of order.

But I do now insist that a year having gone by, the experiment still being of a doubtful nature, that the point of order to the language contained in the bill should be made, and it is just as persuasive and just as effective as the one I made against the language in the bill in 1919, and which the Chairman of the committee sustained, because if this item is in order at all it would be upon the theory that it is the continuation of a public work already in progress, and the Chairman of the committee at that time [Mr. WALSH] gave a ruling to the effect that in his opinion this plant and this experiment was not of such a nature as to bring it within the exception of the continuation of a public work, and unless it can rest upon that exception I do not see how the Chair can hold the item in order. Therefore I make the point of order.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a point of order against the proviso which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] leaves out:

*Provided further*, That at any time during the fiscal year 1922 or thereafter, when the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine that the interests of the Government will be subserved thereby, he is hereby authorized to appraise the buildings, machinery, marine equipment, kelp harvesters, boats, leasehold or contract rights, and all other property of whatever nature or kind appertaining to the experimental kelp potash plant of the Department of Agriculture situated at Summerland, Calif., and to sell the same at public or private sale, at such price or prices, on such terms, and in such manner as he may deem for the best interests of the Government, and in consummation thereof to execute such instruments of conveyance as may be requisite, the proceeds from such sale to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

I do not understand that there is any law now that authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to liquidate this business, and I make the point of order against that, so that we may have the whole question up.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to address myself to both points of order; first, to the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], and second, to the point of order made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON]. There is no law which specifically authorizes the creation, operation, or maintenance of the Government kelp plant at Summerland, Calif. Therefore, if the item can be sustained at all, it must be sustained under the exception to the general rule prohibiting appropriations for purposes not authorized by law, and I desire in that connection to direct the attention of the Chair to the wording of the rule. Clause 2 of Rule XXI provides:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.

Then follow the exceptions to that general rule:

Unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress.

I direct the attention of the Chair especially to the fact that this exception is not confined to public works, but it is also applicable to other objects of expenditure which are in progress. It is true that this exception has usually been taken for the purpose of sustaining items of the character of public works, but the mere fact that the question has usually arisen in connection with appropriations for public works does not of itself limit the application of the exception to public works, and the Chair, of course, has the right to consider the language as it is, and to include within the exception other objects than public works that are in progress.

Now, then, what is the situation with respect to this kelp plant? It was established by an appropriation bill appropriating for its establishment. It has been maintained by congressional appropriations for three years. It is an object which is in progress and in operation to-day.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we can only arrive at a fair application of the rule and its exception if we have recourse to the reasons which must have inspired the House in making it. Clearly, where a new proposition comes before the House in an appropriation bill for an object not authorized by law it may very properly lie in the mouth of one man to say that that new proposition shall not go in the bill and to raise a point of order against it. But it must have been in the minds of the men who framed this rule that where the House has once passed on a question and permitted the establishment of an object or a public work, it ought not to lie in the mouth of one man to say by a point of order that all that had heretofore been done and all that had heretofore been expended should be for naught. It seems to me that it was the intention of the framers of this rule to provide that once the House had decided upon the propriety of a particular object and agreed to it and the policy had been adopted and the work had been begun and the machinery and equipment and buildings necessary for its continuance had been purchased and put into operation, it should not be possible for one man to say that the work should not continue by raising a point of order against the continuance of the object for which the House had once appropriated. And it seems to me that upon the analysis of what must have been the reason for making the exception this item, which does provide for the maintenance and operation of an object which is in progress, is clearly in order.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, just briefly in reply to what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] has stated.

It seems to me that the error of his position lies in this, that the language of the original provision did not contemplate a permanent operation by the Department of Agriculture of a kelp plant for the production of commercial potash. Now, if the position of the gentleman from Minnesota is a correct one, then when once a project of this kind is started as an experiment, it could be carried on indefinitely, unless the House stopped it by striking the item out of the bill.

Now, the Chair very correctly stated yesterday in a ruling that merely because an item is carried in an appropriation bill from year to year does not make it permanent law. In 1917 Congress provided an appropriation of \$175,000 to construct an experimental kelp plant and authorizing the Department of Agriculture to experiment in the production of potash on a commercial scale. This is investigational work, and it is not such a definite public work as the construction of a public building, or the construction of an irrigation dam, or the removal of obstructions from a navigable river, or something of that sort.

But this is an experiment that might run indefinitely and would have no terminating period. And if the contention of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] is a correct one, then any experiment that the Government might start out to conduct would be a public work and would be authorized from year to year merely because it was in continuation of an appropriation that Congress might have authorized in some former appropriation bill.

I think that the Chair will find several precedents where Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole have held that an experiment of this kind is not such a public work as the clause in Rule XXI refers to as an exception to the general rule.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I did not direct my remarks a moment ago to the point of order raised by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON], and I should like to say just a word on that.

The rule which I referred to a moment ago also contains this provision:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as, being germane to the subject matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield one minute?

Mr. ANDERSON. Certainly.

Mr. STEVENSON. I have looked into this. It came up on first blush, and I was not willing to let this plant be abolished, as we are very much interested in potash; but, from further information I have received, I am inclined to think this is a judicious proposition, and therefore will withdraw my point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. I renew the point of order. This is clearly legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the point of order is still pending, I admit, of course, that the provision directing the sale of this plant is legislation. The only question is as to whether it is legislation which is in order under this rule.

It is in order under the rule if the effect of the legislation is to reduce the amounts of money carried in the bill. For that purpose I assume that the Chair has the right to take into consideration the amounts of money which have heretofore been appropriated for this purpose. Last year, for the operation and maintenance of this plant, we carried an appropriation of \$192,000. That was upon the basis of the operation of the plant for 12 months. The appropriation carried in the bill is on the basis of the operation of the plant for approximately seven months, and we have provided for the sale of the plant in order that we might make that reduction; because if the plant is sold as the Secretary is directed to sell it, within seven months, no further appropriation will be required, and through the sale of the plant the amount of the appropriation will not only be reduced this year but it will be reduced next year and every year thereafter until time is no more. It seems to me that this is legislation such as is contemplated under the Holman rule.

The Chair will remember that under the Holman rule we abolished the assay offices. Now, if it is in order under the Holman rule to repeal the law providing for the operation and maintenance of assay offices, it seems to me that it is clearly in order to provide for the sale of Government property the care and maintenance of which requires an expenditure of money out of the Federal Treasury, because, of course, it must be presumed that Congress will provide for the maintenance and care of all Government property.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that there is no authority to sell this building; and if the gentleman's contention is to be accepted as correct an amendment to a bill proposing to dispose of the Congressional Library would be in order, because it would retrench expenditures. You could carry it to the Treasury Department and dispose of every building owned by the Government, because it would retrench expenditures and would eliminate a number of employees and their salaries. There ought to be a limit somewhere to the authority granted.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Minnesota permit the Chair to ask him a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Was \$150,000 the amount originally set aside for the completion of this plant?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; the original appropriation was for \$127,000. The appropriation for the current year is \$192,000; so that the sum carried in the bill is \$42,000 less than was appropriated last year.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Is not the gentleman mistaken in saying that the original appropriation was \$127,000? I was under the impression that it was \$175,000 originally.

Mr. ANDERSON. The appropriation is stated in the Book of Estimates here as \$127,600. There may have been a prior appropriation.

Mr. BLACK. I think there was a prior appropriation in 1917 of \$175,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman may be correct about that. What he states is in accordance with an impression which I myself have, but which does not appear in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Was the original appropriation that has been referred to made under the general authority of the organic act establishing the department?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the appropriation as originally made was subject to a point of order, but no point of order was made at that time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But the activity is being carried on in theory at least under the authority of an executive order?

Mr. ANDERSON. Under the general authority of the department in the organic act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule. Three points of order are leveled against this paragraph. The Chair will take them up in their order.

In reference to the first point of order, lines 16 and 17, "operation and maintenance" of the plant, the Chair would think that that was in continuation of a public work and that this paragraph was in order. Without going further into that

matter the Chair will go on to the next two points, for there is where the crux of the situation lies, in the opinion of the Chair.

Beginning with line 18 of the proviso and running down through line 21 and the first word of line 22, that seems to the Chair purely legislation. Legislation on an appropriation bill is not in accordance with the rule, unless it shows retrenchment according to the Holman rule, and for that reason the Chair will sustain the point of order that has been made against it.

Coming down to the third objection, beginning on line 22 and continuing to the end of the paragraph, the Chair feels that while the proviso might be sustained on other grounds, there is a point on which he should base his position which has not been brought forward by any Member. That is with reference to the words "or thereafter." It would seem to the Chair, basing his opinion on various precedents, so numerous that it seems needless to refer to them, that legislation on an appropriation bill which contains the word "thereafter" is intended to make it permanent law, and therefore is in violation of the rules of the House, and while this may be an incident, the Chair will sustain the point of order on that count. Therefore the Chair sustains both points of order made.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order against the whole paragraph that it should all go out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will sustain that point of order, and the whole paragraph is ruled out.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the completion, operation, and maintenance of the Government kelp plant at Summerland, Calif., \$280,508.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not an appropriation authorized by law and that it is not a continuation of a public work. With all due respect to the decision of the Chair, or rather the Chair's opinion as expressed a moment ago in announcing his decision, that the operation of this experimental kelp plant at Summerland, Calif., was a continuation of a public work, I would like to address the Chair on that point and cite some decisions.

Mr. BLANTON. Before the gentleman does that I will make a further point of order that the amendment as offered from the floor by the gentleman from Minnesota is not germane, and especially it is not germane to the preceding paragraph of the bill to which it is offered. Under the decisions and precedents of the House, as the Chair will remember, it must be germane.

Mr. BLACK. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say in support of my point of order it was admitted, and I think correctly admitted by the gentleman from Minnesota, that this item, which originated in an appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1917, was not in order and would have been subject to a point of order at that time. But we all know that it was a war experiment, and that a great many items of this nature went through at that time without points of order having been made against them because we believed they were necessary and did not desire to do anything which would impede the war preparations.

The proposition now is that having been once admitted in a bill and having been continued for three or four years, is it a continuation of a public work? Upon that subject I find in the House Manual, page 367, paragraph 820, the following language:

By public works and objects already in progress are meant tangible matters like buildings, roads, etc., and not duties of officials in executive departments or the continuance of a work indefinite as to completion and intangible in nature, like the gauging of streams.

Now, then, the kelp plant at Summerland, Calif., has already been built. The machinery is all installed, and for two or three years the Department of Agriculture has been experimenting in the production of potash on a commercial scale.

The proposition is to demonstrate by experiment that it can be produced on a commercial basis. Is that a tangible proposition? Can the Chair have any assurance as to when that project will be completed? When will the Department of Agriculture demonstrate to us that they can produce it on a commercial basis? We have the illustration of last year to show the indefiniteness of the idea. When the bill was up I did not make a point of order when the item was offered the second time because of the assurance that had been made from both sides of the House that the experts of the department said if you will authorize us to carry on this experiment for another year before the year is out we will demonstrate that we can produce and sell more products than it will cost to operate the plant. That would have been a conclusion of the experiment. If that had been done it would have demonstrated that they could produce it on a commercial basis.

What are the facts? I have read the hearings, and they have only produced about \$60,000 worth of potash as against an ex-



penditure of a good part of \$192,000 for the fiscal year. Evidently the experiment is not yet concluded, and so the department desires to carry it on for the fiscal year 1922. All right; suppose we do, then when we come to prepare the bill in 1923 I fear that those in charge of the bill will come in and say, "No, we have not concluded the experiment; we have some more by-products we hope to develop and demonstrate that potash can be produced on a commercial scale from kelp." Therefore, it seems to me that this is an inconclusive matter, one as to which we can not tell when it may come to an end, and it is not such a tangible proposition as is contemplated by the exception to the rule authorizing an appropriation for the continuance of a public work.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. What is the object of this work?

Mr. BLACK. The object of it is to demonstrate that potash can be produced from kelp weed at such a price that it will compete in the commercial markets with other sources of potash.

Mr. WINGO. Have they demonstrated that?

Mr. BLACK. Decidedly not. At least, that is my opinion.

Mr. WINGO. And in spite of the fact that the department reports that they have not, they ask to continue the work?

Mr. BLACK. Yes. They say they think they are now at the point where it can be done.

Mr. WINGO. The object is still in progress; they have not completed it.

Mr. BLACK. That is true.

Mr. WINGO. If that is so, under the rule it is in order.

Mr. BLACK. No; I beg to differ with the gentleman, because it would be only the continuation of an experiment. If the Chair will examine the decisions he will find that it has been repeatedly held that an authorization of an experiment by the department or an investigation by the department is not such a public work as comes within the exception of the rule, but that the words "public work" mean a tangible project, such as the construction of a building, the construction of a road, such as the clearing of a river of obstructions in order to enable navigation; but here we have a plant that has long since been completed, and an experiment is going on which it is admitted by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] would have been out of order as an original proposition. My contention is that the mere fact that it is still being carried on would not make it in order because the tangible part of it, namely, the construction of the public building in which the operations are conducted, is completed.

Mr. WINGO. Has it been ruled at any time—and the gentleman suggested that it had—that an appropriation for clearing a stream, keeping it clear of driftwood, of recurring intermittent creation of sand bars, even though the original work was undertaken by an authorization that would have been subject to a point of order, yet, having been carried in a current appropriation bill and the work started, the engineers reporting that they have not yet completed it, notwithstanding the fact that originally it was contended it never could be done—has it ever been decided that an appropriation to continue that work is not in order? The gentleman left that impression with the Chair, and I want to know whether that is true.

Mr. BLACK. I am unable to answer whether a definite proposition of that kind has been decided, but the gentleman heard me read from the Manual to the effect that such public works as the construction of a building or the construction of a road are the public works contemplated and not an intangible proposition like an experiment.

Mr. WINGO. What was the decision in the Mississippi River case? I know that I rendered the decision, but I have forgotten what the facts were. I held it to be in order.

Mr. BLACK. I am sorry to say that I have not had the benefit of reading the gentleman's decision.

Mr. WINGO. Yes; but the gentleman made an argument in favor of the proposition at the time, as I recall, and I agreed with him. I was trying to remember what the facts were in that case.

Mr. BLACK. I do not recall that particular decision.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, if an appropriation for the establishment and maintenance of this plant had been in order in the first place, it would be in order now, and we would not be arguing the question from the standpoint of an exception to the general rule. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] says that this plant is in operation. It is an existing work. Is the Congress without authority to provide for the operation and the maintenance of an existing work? The Chair is not called upon to go back into the objects and purposes for which this work was established, to see whether those objects and pur-

poses were in order in the first place. The Chair is only called upon to determine whether it is in order to operate and maintain a piece of property that the Government now has. That is the whole question here. It is not a question of whether the investigation was originally authorized or not, but under the amendment that I have offered it is simply a question of whether it is in order to provide for the operation and maintenance of an institution which is a going concern and which is the property of the Government, and which if it is not operated and maintained will deteriorate in value from day to day.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the Chair hear me on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Since the Chair has stricken this paragraph out on a point of order and the committee has failed to put a proper paragraph in the bill not subject to the point of order, the bill comes before the House now with no such subject in it as that offered in the gentleman's amendment. Therefore the Chair will readily see that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] is a new subject not contained in the bill as it comes from the committee. The Chair will remember the decisions which have been made, almost without change, for years and years in the House with respect to new subject matter offered from the floor. The Chair will remember that with respect to almost every one of those provisions the chairman deciding the question has held that a member of the Appropriations Committee, even the chairman himself, on the floor in charge of the bill, so far as offering amendments containing new subjects is concerned, has no more right than any other Member of the House in Committee of the Whole. In other words, he stands on an equal footing with every other Member of the House, and if no other Member from the floor, not on the committee, may offer the amendment, then even the chairman of the committee himself in charge of the bill on the floor has no such right. Therefore, I submit to the Chair, this being an entirely new subject, which is not contained in the bill, it not being germane to the bill, the amendment not being germane to the paragraph immediately preceding it, it is out of order.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking the chairman a question which may have some bearing on the decision of the Chair. The gentleman makes the point of order that the appropriation should be continued because it is a going concern, and unless the appropriation is made the plant will deteriorate and the Government will thereby suffer a loss. I believe it has been said that it is proposed to sell the plant within the next few months.

Mr. ANDERSON. We had a provision of that sort in the item which went out on the point of order.

Mr. SNYDER. What I want to ask the gentleman is this: What will be the loss to the Government if the appropriation is made and the plant is continued for seven months?

Mr. ANDERSON. That, of course, is an open question; but on the basis of the best information that I have, my own judgment is that we would lose next year between \$50,000 and \$70,000, depending somewhat on how soon it is possible to put the plant on a full-capacity basis.

In order to do that would require the installation of a new electric furnace, so as to increase the quantity of charcoal that can be obtained from a given amount of kelp. If the plant is put on an operating basis early next year, there is a possibility it will make all the appropriation.

Mr. SNYDER. My information was that this plant was to be disposed of at the end of a certain period.

Mr. ANDERSON. That has been deferred now, because a point of order was made on that provision.

Mr. SNYDER. The only point I had in my mind was, if the ruling would continue the plant and it should be based upon the assumption that there was to be a depreciation in the value of the plant, I wanted to offset what might be a loss in the operation of the plant between now and the time it was disposed of. It seems to me if the plant is to be operated the loss would be less if you did not put this appropriation in, but would dispose of the plant now.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the question now, as I have said, relates to the germaneness of the present amendment to the bill. The rule provides that no appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill or be in order as an amendment thereto for any expenditure not previously authorized by law. It is admitted here by the chairman of the committee that there is no original authorization of law for this project. It is admitted by him that this is a work in progress, put in effect through the exercise of the discretion of an executive officer of the Department of Agricul-

ture. Therefore it comes back to the original proposition, that the only basis for the germaneness of this amendment is on the fact that it is an existing project that was put into effect by the authority of an executive officer and not by any original specific authorization of law at all. And it seems to me it would be a rather dangerous precedent, Mr. Chairman, to say that the expenditure of public funds, probably appropriated in a lump sum, in the discretion of an officer of the Department of Agriculture, could be made the basis for the violation of this rule, that it was a continuing and existing, unfinished public project, admittedly never authorized by an act of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule. The Chair will first take up the point made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The Chair is of the opinion that this amendment is in order in this particular part of the bill. A few paragraphs back of where we now are reference is made to the investigation of the "possible supply of potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers." This plant is, of course, a plant that was established to produce potash. It seems to me that it is clearly in order in this place in the bill, and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The Chair will now take up the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK]. The Chair realizes that the gentleman has made a very strong argument in behalf of the point order he has made. The Chair desires to speak first of one or two things with reference to the general proposition.

It has been held in volume 4 of Hinds' Precedents, paragraph 3707, in the ruling of the Chair in that decision, that if the work be a public work, and is already in progress, then there need not be any previous legislative authority for the work. That, the Chair thinks, probably answers the objection made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] in his point. I think we must assume that that plant has been established in California; that it is in existence. It is a tangible proposition. It is not a theory; it is a fact. And the Chair bases his opinion on a precedent in volume 4 of Hinds, paragraph 3801, which cites that:

An appropriation for operating and repairing a sawmill already constructed by the Government was held to be in continuation of a public work.

Now, if it is in continuation of a public work to maintain a sawmill, it would seem to the Chair it would be a continuation of public work to continue this kelp plant at Summerland, Calif. In view of the fact that the Chair feels, from the rule that was cited by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], "that public works already in progress must be tangible matters, like buildings," and so forth, the Chair thinks this is a continuation of a public work within the rule. The Chair so holds and overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON to the amendment now pending: Strike out "\$208,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000." "Provided, That at any time during the fiscal year 1922, when the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine that the interests of the Government will be subserved thereby, he is hereby authorized to appraise the buildings, machinery, marine equipment, kelp harvesters, boats, leasehold or contract rights, and all other property of whatever nature or kind appertaining to the experimental kelp potash plant of the Department of Agriculture situated at Summerland, Calif., and to sell the same at public or private sale, at such price or prices, on such terms, and in such manner as he may deem for the best interests of the Government, and in consummation thereof to execute such instruments of conveyance as may be requisite, the proceeds from such sale to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman whether or not his amendment is exactly like the bill as read, after the figures "\$150,000," with the exception that the proviso, lines 18 to 22, is omitted and the words "or thereafter" on line 23 are omitted?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Chair is correct in that.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak against the amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa makes a point of order against the amendment. On what ground?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is not authorized by law to dispose of the plant, which is new legislation.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that it is not only not authorized by existing law but it is a different proposition in saying that the Secretary shall sell than that the Secretary shall have discretion to sell if he wants to do so. There is a clear discretion expressed in that.

I think if it shows on its face that it will retrench expenditures, not simply during the coming year but during next year or any year thereafter, that would bring it within the Holman rule. But I do not think you can apply the Holman rule if the legislation is not a retrenching of public expenditure, but which authorizes somebody to exercise a discretion if he wishes to retrench. That is not the Holman rule. The Holman rule is that the House must exercise its judgment and, by its affirmative, direct action, or its action covered by the proposed amendment, retrench. This does not do that at all. The Secretary will direct the sale, perhaps, but it gives him the discretion. We can not speculate and be indefinite. There must be a definite retrenchment on the face of the amendment to be in order under the Holman rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have said all I care to say on the question. I think the Chair is already sufficiently informed. I do not desire to discuss the point of order now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman realizes that this point is a close one. The provision of the rule cited by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo] is familiar to all of us, and the Chair will not repeat it.

Mr. WINGO. May I make this suggestion to the Chair? The Chair, when he suggested the "hereafter" matter, really had the crux of it in mind; the indefiniteness of it—that is the trouble with this amendment. The same suggestion that came to the mind of the Chair as to "hereafter" was that this was permanent legislation and gave somebody discretion unless Congress affirmatively repealed this act.

That same defect goes to the pending amendment, that it does not affirmatively legislate and affirmatively retrench, but simply says to the executive officer, "You may exercise a discretion, which Congress has under its rule to retrench, if you see fit, in the future, limited to the fiscal year."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Arkansas that he did not intend to convey the idea that the word "hereafter" was the controlling factor. It was merely an incident to the whole situation, and not really the crux of his decision.

As the Chair stated, he is somewhat dubious about this proposition, but the Chair will try to answer one or two questions. Does the proviso reduce the amount of money covered by the bill? On its face it does not. However, it appears that in the current law \$192,900 was appropriated for the maintenance of this plant. It is stated that \$150,000 was included in the present bill for a portion of the coming fiscal year, based on the prospect of selling the plant as indicated in the proviso. If the plant is sold, it seems a logical conclusion to assume that no further appropriation will be required for it. If the proviso is not agreed to, it will be necessary to increase the appropriation to \$208,500 in order properly to maintain this plant during the next fiscal year. Therefore, while the proviso on its face does not indicate a reduction in the amount of money in the bill under consideration, yet it seems to the Chair a logical conclusion that the proviso will bring about a saving of money formerly carried in this bill and liable to be carried in the future. The Chair feels that the principle laid down by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is sound; that an amendment, or a provision in a bill reported from the Committee on Appropriations, changing existing law and clearly a retrenchment within the three methods provided in the rule, may include legislation directly instrumental in accomplishing the reduction, provided it is not permanent legislation, that is, legislation beyond the life of the bill under consideration.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. In considering whether or not we shall adopt this amendment and again appropriate \$150,000 for this purpose, it is well to take into consideration how much we have already expended on this experiment. We appropriated in 1917, the original appropriation, \$175,000. In 1918 no additional appropriation was made, because the construction of the plant had not yet been completed, and so a reappropriation was made of the unexpended balance. Then in 1919 we appropriated \$127,600 more. In 1920 we appropriated \$127,600. In the present fiscal year 1921 we appropriated \$192,900. Thus we have appropriated or expended on this experiment \$623,100, and if we appropriate \$150,000 more,



it will mean that we shall have appropriated for this one purpose and one experiment \$773,100.

Now, I have no criticism to make of the fact that this experiment has not been a success from a commercial standpoint and has not sold products of anything like as great aggregate value as the cost of operation. It was of course originally authorized as an experiment and not with the idea of yielding a profit to the Government, but it seems to me that we have reached a point where, in the interest of economy, we ought to discontinue it. It seems that about all the information is developed that we could reasonably expect, even if it should be operated further.

Now, how much product has been sold, including potash, iodine, and charcoal? The Book of Estimates shows that up to the 20th of August, 1920, a total of \$114,423.04 worth of product had been sold, as against an appropriation aggregating \$623,100; and it must be remembered that a great deal of this \$114,423.04 was sold at high war prices, because during the war there was a complete cessation of imports into this country of potash, and therefore the price of the product went to unprecedented heights.

Now, the project was originally an experiment. When the Great War broke out in 1914 we were getting most of our potash from Strassburg and Alsace and Lorraine, and Germany immediately put an embargo upon its export, and so we had to set about to develop whatever source we could develop, and one of the methods that was suggested was to go out on the Pacific coast and harvest the great seaweed kelp, carry it to reduction plants, and make it into potash.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what kind of work does that involve? Kelp is 90 per cent water. Therefore it means for every ton of kelp that you carry into the kelp plant you carry 1,800 pounds of water and 200 pounds of solid, and in that 200 pounds of solid only 30 pounds of potash is produced. Therefore that means that out of every ton of kelp that you collect out of the Pacific Ocean and transfer to the kelp plant you get only 30 pounds of potash. Figure out how many tons of kelp seaweed you have to harvest and carry to the kelp plant and reduce to potash before you have got a ton of potash. I figure that it takes 132,000 pounds of kelp to make a ton of potash.

And yet gentlemen tell me that we can develop this experiment to such a success that the prudent business men of this country will take hold of it and endeavor to compete with the great natural deposits in Alsace-Lorraine and Strassburg. Why, since this bill was up I called up the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce, and they told me that there has already been imported into this country from Alsace-Lorraine—which is now a French Province—and from the German provinces during 11 months 784,370 tons of the different grades of potash, at a total cost of \$32,423,000, which, as I figure it out, averages \$41.30 per ton, and I am told by the Shipping Board that the freight on potash from European ports to ports on the Atlantic coast ranges from \$5.25 a ton to \$5.75 a ton. Now, what man in this House is going to contend seriously that business men can harvest seaweed that yields only 30 pounds of potash to a ton and compete with great natural resources of potash which can be sold at a very much less price than the prices which prevailed during the war?

Mr. STEVENSON. What is the per cent of pure potash contained in the 30 pounds produced from the seaweed?

Mr. BLACK. I have not stated that.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman ought to state that.

Mr. BLACK. I have not looked into it. Of the 784,000 tons imported in 11 months of this year about 349,000 tons were kainite, I believe, 303,313 tons were muriates of potash, and the balance of other grades. I do not recall the technical names, but the total tonnage, including the lower grades and the higher grades, was 784,000 and the average prices on all of it, as I figure it, was \$41.30 a ton plus the freight.

Mr. STEVENSON. You can not give us the chemical analysis?

Mr. BLACK. No. The gentleman is from a State which uses large amounts of commercial fertilizers and no doubt knows the analysis better than I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close at the end of 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Minnesota designate the Members who are to have the time?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think the gentleman would be authorized to do that.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I desire to present the views that influenced the subcommittee in recommending the provisions contained in the bill.

I realize that, so far as demonstrating the commercial possibility of potash, this experiment has proceeded so far that we now know that it can not be successfully done unless the by-products—carbon and iodine—shall be so developed as to make it a paying proposition. But the committee was confronted with this situation: Last year by the operation of this plant we lost \$80,000. The gentleman who is in charge of the operation of the plant believes that by reason of the development of the by-product carbon during the next year he will be able to run without any loss and, if anything, at a profit. Grant that he can operate not at a profit but without loss, let us determine how it shall be disposed of. If that plant is scrapped, the estimate is that if sold when not in operation we would get for the plant \$25,000 or \$30,000. If sold as a going plant in operation, we should get about \$100,000. If we make no appropriation, but simply direct that it be sold, the corporations of the country who may be interested in the purchase of the property will know that if they wait until July 1 the plant will not be in operation, and after that it can be purchased for a small percentage of what it is worth as a going plant. If we make this appropriation and carry this direction to sell, the Secretary of Agriculture will take steps to sell it. It can run for some months during the next fiscal year, and then we will have a better opportunity to secure for the Government a greater price for the plant. The daily revenues now amount to \$430, and will doubtless increase. If it is ordered sold now and we do not provide any money for its operation during the next fiscal year, we will force the sale of the property at a time when business concerns are not extending their purchases but are restricting their activities, at a time when they are unable to borrow money except at high rates of interest. By making this appropriation and providing for its operation for at least part of the next fiscal year we will lose little, if anything, by operation and we will then sell it at a time when money will be easier, when business men will desire to extend their activities, and the Treasury will receive more money than if we follow the policy that is suggested by the amendment to scrap the plant and sell it as an idle plant. It is a business proposition that should appeal to the judgment of the House, regardless of what their views may be as to the wisdom of operating the plant, that we will receive more money by making this appropriation and selling the plant as a going concern.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SNYDER). The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] for five minutes.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I will not attempt to add to the argument that we should appropriate \$150,000 so that we may sell a plant that we own for \$100,000. Every Member of this House knows that when we appropriate money for one of these departments that money is expended. I can not conceive of the argument that we should appropriate \$150,000 so that we may sell a plant for \$100,000. I can not conceive that that argument will be taken seriously by members of the committee.

The distinguished gentleman who just preceded me [Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina] was absolutely right as a member of this subcommittee while acting as such member. It was his question that elicited the information that last year we spent \$192,000 on this plant and manufactured \$60,000 worth of products. It was on the same page that another distinguished member of this subcommittee asked this question, and I want the members of the Committee of the Whole to listen to it.

Mr. Harrison, private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture, testified that he thought if you would let him go on another year he could do better. One member of the subcommittee said, "That is what you said last year, and I went up and buncoed the House on that theory." Dr. Whitney, who comes to the rescue of Mr. Harrison, says, "Do it again; it is all right." [Laughter.]

Then another distinguished member of the subcommittee read from the hearings of last year to Dr. Whitney, and called his attention to the fact that they made that selfsame promise last year, that they were going to get on a business basis if they would let them go along one more year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. That is what they said on the floor.

Mr. TINCHER. Yes; and surely we ought not to be buncoed this year by appropriating \$150,000 to sell a plant for \$100,000.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Dr. Whitney says that the charcoal they are developing on the side is worth \$500 a ton; that it is a very fine article; but when you get the details as to the disposition of it, up to this time all they could do was to give it away. [Laughter.]

Mr. TINCER. Yes; the experiment has failed, and now is the Government going to spend money on that experiment which is a failure, and will the record show that year after year, at the request of Dr. Somebody, or the private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture, they will continue to spend a sum of money greater than they estimate they could sell the plant for? I think we ought to defeat the amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Kansas misunderstood my statement. My statement was based on the acceptance of the opinion of these gentlemen that during the next year they would operate not at a loss, and that being true, the \$150,000 which we appropriate for operation would be covered by the profits of the concern. If he does not make good there would be a loss. Outside of the operation the question is whether we will sell for \$25,000 a plant that is idle or for \$100,000 a plant that is in operation.

Mr. TINCER. I would not have taken the floor except for the fact that I was one of the Members that was buncoed last year by these same promises, and I do not want to repeat it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman is not referring to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. TINCER. No; the gentleman who asked the question was more familiar with the facts than is the gentleman from South Carolina. [Laughter.]

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the position of the gentleman from South Carolina reminds me of the fellow who, desiring to start a get-rich-quick scheme, started a cat ranch in California. He found that cat hides could be sold for 80 cents each. He decided to purchase 100,000 cats. In order to eliminate the expense of feeding the cats, his plan was to start an adjoining rat ranch and feed the rats to the cats. Of course, he must feed the rats, so he decided to feed the rats on the dead carcasses of the cats that he skinned. [Laughter.] Thus he could operate both ranches practically without cost.

Now, last year this same proposition was up, and Dr. Tarentine, in charge of the plant, in making a plea for the continuation during the last year estimated that the plant would produce \$290,000 worth of potash and other products. He said if we let them run the last year it would not lose like it did the year before, but they would make \$290,000, and by means of that estimate he secured an appropriation of \$192,000. In the hearings of this year Dr. Whitney, the chief of the Bureau of Soils, says that the plant produced \$90,000 last year, out of an expenditure of \$192,000, and yet on the following page of the hearings, 436, it is shown that they have only produced since the establishment was started a total of \$114,423 worth of products. During the war some of it sold at \$450 a ton, as that was when we could not import any article of that kind. If they had been compelled to sell the product at its actual value in a competitive market they could not have sold anything like \$114,000 worth.

Now, I want to call attention to a further fact. There are in this country actual potash beds, not a lot of seaweeds from which you can squeeze a little potash, but there are in the Southwest certain great salt basins which the Bureau of Chemistry has determined contain a great amount of potash. There is potash in paying quantities if the machinery were placed there to develop it. The only reason it is not developed by private enterprise is the fact that there are many potash mines in foreign countries that can produce potash at a very low figure. It seems to me that if the Government of the United States is going to make any appropriation for potash it ought to make it to be spent not on seaweed but on potash. The idea of continuing an appropriation to carry on a business that on the testimony of the manager has only produced since its establishment about one-half of the appropriation they ask for this year, with the continued promise year after year that they are going to make it a paying proposition when none of the promises have been carried out, is absurd.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend the remarks in the Record that I have already made on potash.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to reduce the sum from \$150,000—

The CHAIRMAN. There are still seven minutes left for debate on the amendment as it now stands.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will I be recognized at the close of that time to offer an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The time was limited to 20 minutes on this amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. At the expiration of that time other amendments will be in order and time will be allowed on them?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, that would be the rule.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the hearings on this help item has produced an interesting record. If the record of this and last session were confused one would scarcely notice the fact, except that the record this year clearly shows that they have abandoned all idea of ever making this proposition pay as a potash producer. There is no sort of doubt about that at all. But now they perhaps have more different things, by-products, which they can produce, which they have accumulated as the emergency progressed. I want to direct serious consideration to this rather illuminating testimony in regard to the activities of this plant. Mr. Whitney was on the stand, and I am going to read very briefly from his testimony. Mr. Whitney says:

We are now developing an absorbent charcoal of the highest grade that the world has produced; it is worth \$500 per ton and there is great demand for it.

One would imagine from that statement that they were getting somewhere with the proposition. To continue—

It is worth \$500 a ton and there is great demand for it. We have also been recovering iodine, potash salts—

Then somebody interrupted him, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], and called attention to the fact that the price of charcoal had evidently gone up since his last statement. Mr. ANDERSON called his attention to the fact that in his statement last year it was worth only \$300 a ton, but what is a little difference of \$200 a ton when you are trying to save a great plant like this? Here is what they did with this \$500-a-ton stuff, and I am reading from the testimony, and if anyone questions this I will be very glad to have him read the book.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman tell the House who Mr. Whitney is?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Whitney says:

It is \$500 now.

I can just picture that scene in that committee room—driven by inability to defend this as a potash proposition he proposes to make it a charcoal burner.

It is \$500 now, and the demand is increasing.

I want to show you how this demand is increasing.

From the chemical industry there is a very great demand.

Mr. Chairman, I can just see the picture of that man sitting across the table from my good friend from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and the gentleman in charge of the bill. A very great demand for this!

Mr. ANDERSON. There is.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Very well, I will show you what sort of a demand there is, although he has not been able to get rid of all that they have as yet. He continues:

The preparation has been exceedingly difficult. We have not made as much progress as we had hoped. The charcoal has to be reheated in an electric furnace, a very ingenious device that was built at the help plant; we had to devise the whole thing for our particular work. We have made sufficient of this to send around for factory demonstration; that is, we will get out a ton and we will send a ton to any person who will give it a thorough trial.

Mr. Chairman, that is the stuff for which there is a very great demand, worth \$500 a ton. They will give it to any of these factories which will haul it away!

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following as a substitute, reducing the amount from \$150,000 to \$25,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON]: Strike out "\$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at the end of 10 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment upon which I would like to be heard.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then I will confine it to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the amendment offered by



the gentleman from Michigan close at the end of 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this proposition was started several years ago purely as an experiment, when there was shortage of potash and great need of it, as everyone knows. The Committee on Agriculture was always doubtful, very skeptical, as to the success of the experiment, and I think I am stating the situation correctly when I say that a year ago, previous to the appearing before it of the gentleman representing the bureau, the idea prevailed that no appropriation should be made and that the experiment should be stopped; but statements of the bureau made a year ago were very promising, to the effect that the plant could be operated successfully. It was stated that they were just on the point of success, and, relying upon that, an appropriation of \$192,000 for this fiscal year was made. Now it is determined, everybody concedes that the thing is a failure. If we stop appropriating money we close up the business. What is to be done? Shall we continue the appropriation practically as it was before and let the thing run at a loss simply in order that it may be a going concern, with the prospect of getting a little more money than we would get if we stopped? It seems to me that all we ought to be asked to do is to appropriate a little money so that the property will not fall into decay. Let there be watchmen or somebody there to take care of it. I do not think it should be operated. It seems to me \$25,000 will be enough. I appreciate the difficulty the committee labored under to know what to do with this white elephant the Government has on its hands at Summerland, Calif. Appreciating their difficulty, I hesitate to criticize their action in now recommending \$150,000, but after listening to all that has been said, giving it more thought myself, I venture to differ from them. I think the expenditure of \$150,000 during the coming fiscal year would be unnecessary and unwise and that all we ought to appropriate is simply enough to keep the thing in some decent shape, so that it will not materially depreciate, so that it may be kept in shape for sale. Therefore I offer as an amendment the sum of \$25,000 instead of \$150,000.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. I understood the gentleman to say that we should not operate the plant, but should prepare to close it, because it is a failure?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Every day that it is operated the Government loses a large sum of money. Everybody acknowledges that it is a failure.

Mr. REAVIS. And yet the gentleman's amendment calls for an appropriation of \$25,000 to operate the plant?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is the wording of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON]. I do not quite approve of that, but what I am trying to do is to save money, and I would reduce the sum from \$150,000 to \$25,000.

Mr. SNELL. Can the gentleman inform the House how much money, all told, has been lost on this proposition?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I understand that about three-quarters of a million dollars have been appropriated and spent, and \$114,000 worth of product has been sold.

Mr. SNELL. The object of your amendment is simply to close it down as quickly as possible and make the loss as small as possible to the Government?

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Does the gentleman concede that the amount to be received from the plant, if sold, when not running, is accurately stated?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not know. I think it is speculation on the part of all gentlemen who have talked about it. Nobody knows what that plant, conceded by everybody to be a failure, will bring.

Mr. HASTINGS. Why is it necessary to have any appropriation? If we lose the money, the sooner we sell it the better.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. This bill, if it becomes a law, will be operative only during the next fiscal year. I apprehend if we are going to direct something to be done during this fiscal year it might be subject to a point of order.

Mr. HASTINGS. If we do not make any appropriation for it, of course, there will not be any arrangement for it to be run after June 30. It is incumbent upon them to dispose of it before that time.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It may be well to have some money in the hands of the bureau to take care of the property and keep it in some sort of shape available for sale, and let that sum be just as small as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] has expired.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. JONES of Texas. As I understand, the substitute is to amend certain language in the Anderson amendment, and my amendment simply amends the substitute by striking out certain language.

Mr. ANDERSON. I make the point of order that another amendment is not in order at this time.

Mr. JONES of Texas. An amendment to the substitute is in order. The amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] reinserts the language of the bill, and a substitute is offered, and the substitute carries the language which I designate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, there can be but one amendment to an amendment pending at the same time.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I am offering an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let us listen to the reading of the amendment and see.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Texas offers an amendment: Page 47, line 22, after the word "at," strike out "any" and insert in lieu thereof the word "some," and on page 48, line 1, after the word "authorized," insert the words "and directed."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the portion of the bill to which the amendment is offered is not in the bill now, and the further point of order that there being one amendment to the amendment that I offered pending another amendment is not in order.

Mr. JONES of Texas. As a matter of fact, I do not think the gentleman had a right to offer the second amendment, but that has been passed over. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, and then he offers another amendment in which he includes the language which I mention. Now, another gentleman offered a substitute, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], which leaves most of the language of both the amendments of the gentleman from Minnesota in the bill. In other words, it just reduces the appropriation. Now, I offered to amend the substitute, which substitute includes the language of both amendments, with the exception of the words that are specified and stricken out. I offered to amend that substitute by an amendment which strikes out certain language included in the substitute and those amendments.

Mr. ANDERSON. The substitute does not contain the language which the gentleman proposes to amend. You can offer it after the McLaughlin amendment is disposed of, but can not offer it now.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The amendment of the gentleman from Michigan includes all language of both the amendments of the gentleman from Minnesota, except certain figures, which he strikes out. And so all that language is included. I do not insist on the page and line designation. But where the words occur in the Anderson amendment I offer a substitute to the substitute of the gentleman from Michigan, which carries the language. And the amendment to the substitute is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands the gentleman, his amendment to the substitute refers to these various lines, but he has not referred to the lines of the bill, because those have been stricken out.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I did not have the lines, and I asked that the Clerk in reading not designate the lines at all, but just refer to the words in the substitute which are identified in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not want to preclude the gentleman from Texas from offering an amendment, but we seem in the condition that here is an amendment which the gentleman desires to offer, which does not have a proper place in the procedure at the present time, and the Chair feels the point of order made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] is well taken. Perhaps it will be possible for the gentleman from Texas to have his amendment considered at some other stage of the proceedings.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to debate the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan. Of course, the gentleman from Texas can offer his amendment to the amendment I offered as soon as the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan is disposed of, and I hope the House will consider it, as it undoubtedly will.

The debate that has taken place this morning I think very clearly indicates the disposition on the part of the House to close up this proposition and get rid of it. I think it is the sense of the House to sell this plant. And the committee was of that opinion. The only other question that the committee considered was the question whether it was wiser to close up the experiment immediately at the end of this fiscal year and sell the plant for its junk value or allow the plant to run for six or seven months of the next fiscal year, during which time an attempt might be made to put it on a better commercial basis and sell it as a commercial proposition for its going value.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. What reasonable prospect would there be of selling this plant as a going concern when it is admittedly a failure?

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman says it is admittedly a failure. I do not think it is.

Mr. HUSTED. That seems to be the general sentiment of the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. That may be true; that may be the opinion of the committee. I think that so far it has failed to demonstrate the thing for which it was originally established, but I do not think it is a failure in the sense that it is not possible to demonstrate that thing within the next fiscal year. However, I was of the opinion that it was not desirable to appropriate for the entire fiscal year.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to make a statement, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman said he did not think this was a failure. It might not be a failure in war time, but—

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not make quite that statement.

Mr. BLANTON. I understood the gentleman to say he did not think it was a failure, in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED]. I want to say to the gentleman that in peace times a plant that had been running approximately three years and had cost the Government between \$800,000 and \$900,000 and had brought in just a little over \$100,000—I would like to know how anything like that could be anything but a failure in peace times?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, it was started as an experiment, and it has been necessary to work out these problems as we went along. It was not expected that the plant could be put upon a commercial basis immediately. All of these problems were new. The machinery for making it had to be developed out of thin air, as it were. Nobody had any idea of the method it was necessary to employ, except as might be gathered from general research along chemical and mechanical lines.

Now, then, as I said, there were three propositions to be considered:

One to drop the project at the end of the fiscal year and sell the plant; the next was to run it five or six months and try to dispose of the plant in that time; and third, to let it run the entire year, and then try to dispose of the plant at the end of the year. Those were the three propositions. As between the three the committee thought the wisest policy, taking everything into consideration, was to let the plant run for six months and in the meantime give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to dispose of it, and that is the proposition embodied in the amendment I have offered. The amendment of the gentleman from Michigan will result in the stoppage of the operation of the plant at the end of this fiscal year. It will thereafter only be maintained for the purpose of preventing depletion, and I suppose will have to be sold for its dismantled value.

Those are the propositions presented by the gentleman from Michigan and myself by the amendment he has offered and by the amendment I have offered. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote now comes on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, the second amendment he offered, an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON to the original Anderson amendment: Strike out "\$208,500" and insert "\$150,000," and add the following: "Provided, That at any time during the fiscal year 1922 or thereafter, when the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine that the interests of the Government will be subserved thereby, he is hereby authorized to appraise the buildings, machinery, marine equipment, kelp harvesters, boats, leasehold or contract rights, and all other property of whatever nature or kind appertaining to the experimental kelp potash plant of the Department of Agriculture situated at Summerland, Calif., and to sell the same at public or private sale, at such price or prices,

on such terms, and in such manner as he may deem for the best interests of the Government, and in consummation thereof to execute such instruments of conveyance as may be requisite, the proceeds from such sale to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, does not the vote first come on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. While the Chair feels that the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan indicates that it is in substance an amendment, he considered it as a substitute, for he thought the gentleman had so determined it when he offered it in order that it could be pending. The parliamentary situation is that an amendment has been offered to which another amendment has been presented. This precludes another amendment, and in order to get around that parliamentary situation the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] offered his amendment as a substitute.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understood, as the Clerk read it, that the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan is simply to strike out "\$150,000" from my amendment and insert "\$25,000"; and if that is so his proposition was clearly an amendment and not a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. That is undoubtedly the case. The Chair thinks the reason why the gentleman from Michigan offered it as a substitute was to avoid offering an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. ANDERSON. No point of order was made. The question should be on that amendment first, because if my amendment is agreed to the sum of \$150,000 would be agreed to, and an amendment to change the amount would not be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. While the gentleman from Minnesota has stated the proposition correctly, the Chair feels he is bound by the practice of the House, which, as he understands it, would bring the vote first on the amendment to the amendment; second, on any amendment that might be offered to the substitute; third, on the substitute; and fourth, on the original amendment to the text. To remedy the situation the Chair, if the committee will permit, would suggest that by unanimous consent the order of voting on the amendments be altered so that the vote will come on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan before the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota. If this should be done the amendments will be disposed of in their proper sequence.

Mr. FESS. That can be done if the Chair decides that the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan is a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what the Chair did decide, but as the gentleman from Minnesota points out it will not clear the situation in the way intended, for it will make futile a vote on the other amendment in case his amendment prevails. The Chair feels a change in the order of voting is the best and quickest remedy.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we may vote on the McLaughlin amendment first. That would solve the situation, as it seems to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the best solution. The Chair will put the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] that the vote be first taken on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan before the vote is taken on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote now comes on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is asked for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 44, noes 19.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote now comes on the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, as amended by the amendment just adopted.

The question was taken; and on a division (suggested by the Chair) there were—ayes 69, noes 0.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment as amended.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that motion is not now in order.

Mr. FESS. There is nothing now before the House.

Mr. BLACK. The amendment as amended must now be submitted to the House. Is it not in order, then, to offer a substitute?



Mr. BLANTON. The original Anderson amendment is before the House now, Mr. Chairman. The last vote was on the second Anderson amendment.

Mr. BLACK. I offer my amendment as a substitute for the original amendment as amended.

Mr. ANDERSON. I withdraw my point of order. That is correct, if it is a substitute to the whole proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON as amended: "For the care and maintenance of the Government kelp plant at Summerland, Calif., \$5,000: *Provided*, That at any time during the fiscal year 1922 or thereafter, when the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine that the interests of the Government will be subserved thereby, he is hereby authorized to appraise the buildings, machinery, marine equipment, kelp harvesters, boats, leasehold or contract rights, and all other property of whatever nature or kind appertaining to the experimental kelp potash plant of the Department of Agriculture situated at Summerland, Calif., and to sell the same at public or private sale, at such price or prices, on such terms, and in such manner as he may deem for the best interests of the Government, and in consummation thereof to execute such instruments of conveyance as may be requisite, the proceeds from such sale to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at the end of seven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in seven minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I will not take up any time discussing the merits of the amendment, but will just simply explain to the House what the amendment is. The Anderson amendment as amended by the amendment from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] provides \$25,000 for the operation of the plant in the fiscal year 1922. Now, my amendment changes that so as to provide \$5,000 for its care and maintenance, so that the department can put a man out there to look after it and see that it does not deteriorate, burn up, or something of that kind. Then I use the same language as the Anderson amendment, and authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to go ahead and appraise the property and make a sale of it. Not only that, I have changed it, and make it apply to the rest of the fiscal year 1921, so that he can begin now to look for a buyer during the rest of this fiscal year and continue on until he sells the plant. That is the nature of the amendment, and that is all I wish to say.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I offer an amendment to the Black amendment by inserting, after the word "authorized," the words "and directed."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Texas offers an amendment to the Black amendment to insert, after the word "authorized," the words "and directed."

Mr. JONES of Texas. The purpose of the amendment is clear. It is simply to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of this.

Mr. ANDERSON. The only result of that amendment would be to make it impossible for the Secretary of Agriculture to get anything for the plant, because everybody who knows he has got to sell it is not going to pay him much for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote now comes on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The question being taken, the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote now comes on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] as amended by the substitute just adopted.

The question being taken, the amendment as amended by the substitute was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting deciduous fruits, orchards, vineyards, and nuts, \$178,500.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], chairman of the subcommittee having the bill in charge, if the various activities in connection with the entomological service rendered to the various vineyards in the United States are taken care of in this bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes. The same amount is appropriated this year as in previous years, and in some instances increases have been made.

Mr. SHREVE. Back in the Sixty-third Congress I secured the passage of a bill providing for the service of an entomologist in northeastern Pennsylvania, in the heart of the Pennsylvania grape belt, and this was carried for a number of years, but I notice that in the last few years a number of these items have been dropped out. I just wanted to be satisfied that the great grape interests of Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, California, and other States of the Union will be provided for under this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. From time to time provisions have been made for investigation and control work in connection with various insects. The policy has been to cover these different provisions into the general item, which now carries all the money that is necessary for work of the character which the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. SHREVE. Then I understand that when some insect pest is discovered in any one of the vineyards, all we have to do is to send down to the Department of Agriculture and they will take care of it. Is that the idea?

Mr. ANDERSON. They have a man to send out for that purpose.

Mr. SHREVE. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting cereal and forage crops, including a special investigation of the Hessian fly and the chinch bug, \$150,660.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee if there is any appropriation in this bill providing for the investigation of the rose midge or the strawberry beetle? There are millions of dollars invested in rose culture, and I understand that the roses are destroyed by a midge and that an insecticide is desired to destroy the midge but not the flower. I would like to introduce an amendment to cover that without increasing the appropriation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say that there is ample authority in the general appropriations in the bill to do that work. If no additional money was provided the situation would not be changed at all in that respect.

Mr. WATSON. What part of the bill provides for the investigation of the rose midge? The many rose growers in my district are very anxious that an investigation be made, as it is not possible to destroy the midge without destroying the flower.

Mr. ANDERSON. The provision for doing that sort of work is carried now under the item for the investigation of insects affecting citrus and other tropical and subtropical fruits.

Mr. WATSON. Would that include insects indoors also?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; some work is now being done on the bug that the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. WATSON. Would the chairman of the subcommittee object to the introduction of an amendment to insert the words "strawberry beetle and insects indoors, including the rose midge"?

Mr. ANDERSON. It has no relation whatever to the item that has just been read.

Mr. WATSON. I do not know where else to put it, because there does not seem to be any place where it can be introduced.

Mr. ANDERSON. If it belongs in the bill at all—and I am not discussing that question now—it ought to be included on page 50, in the paragraph beginning on line 11—

For investigations of insects affecting citrus and other tropical and subtropical plants, and for investigations and control of the Mediterranean and other fruit flies, in cooperation with the Federal Horticultural Board, \$51,500.

There is where it belongs, if it belongs anywhere in the bill.

Mr. WATSON. Then I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws his pro forma amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, line 21, after the word "fly" insert the word "grasshopper", and in line 22, strike out the figures "\$150,660" and insert in lieu thereof "\$175,660."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this amendment calls for an increase in this item of \$25,000. I have been informed by the department that the appropriation item carried in this and former bills was never designed to cover the matter of grasshopper control or eradication, and that any money that has been used in the past for this purpose has been robbed from some other use for which the money was expected to be used.

Now, we have suffered in our State very seriously from this pest. In one county alone, Bottineau, there was promise of 4,000,000 bushels of wheat last year, and they did not market a single bushel of wheat in that county. The grasshoppers took the crop entirely. In some other counties the crop was almost entirely destroyed.

On June 18 a telegram was sent to the Secretary of Agriculture from the board of county commissioners of Bottineau County that read like this:

Bottineau County seeks immediate Federal aid in the sum of \$100,000 for fighting grasshopper pest to save one of the most promising crops it has had for years. On account of three successive crop failures the available reserves of the county for this purpose, \$50,000 in all, have already been exhausted. Considerable damage has already been done. Private individuals doing their best to combat the pest but outside help must be immediately sent if we are to save crop of hard spring wheat, estimated at 4,000,000 bushels. The expenditure of this money will be confined solely to purchase of material. All of the citizens of this county are engaged in this campaign and will bear the expense of distribution, mixing, spreading, and all other expense. Even the road funds of the townships have been diverted for this purpose. The Province of Manitoba, joining us on the north, are taking effective steps through provincial aid and are successfully combating the pest. Wire me the amount of money that the Federal Government is willing to contribute to this county for this purpose with authorization for its immediate use.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,  
GEO. SIDNER, Chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON. How was that \$50,000 expended?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Buying poison; not a dollar was used in hiring men to spread it. It was used entirely to buy poison, and the farmers themselves spread and used it.

The telegram received in reply to this telegram from the Secretary of Agriculture was that they had no appropriation and at that particular time they had no men available that they could send to North Dakota. Later on they sent a man from Oregon, but it was necessary to wait until he completed his work there and he did not arrive in North Dakota as soon as he should. I am not criticizing the department for the delay in getting him there; the department was doing the best it could with the means available. Now, I am hoping that the chairman of this subcommittee will not object to this moderate increase in this item.

The grasshopper pest is liable to strike any State at any time, and the time to fight it and resist it is when it comes and not afterwards.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Will the gentleman from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Is it the purpose of this amendment to use this money in the purchase of some sort of insect powder or Paris green and scatter it over the country?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. No; every dollar of it will be used to give these people who want to fight it a proper kind of leadership and a proper kind of instruction.

Mr. MCKENZIE. What is the character of the instruction?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The instruction that they have been giving in the past is how to put out poison. Arsenic is the kind of poison used mixed with bran.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Do the farmers buy the poison?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. We are not proposing in the bill that the United States shall buy it, but we feel that if the Government of the United States will take hold of the question in each area, North Dakota, Illinois, or anywhere where it is reported, organize the farmers of each community and give them proper instructions, it will be of immense value to the farmers whose crops are threatened, and also of value to the people of the country whether living in cities, towns, or country districts.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I am seeking information. The appropriation will be expended by hiring certain individuals to go out into North Dakota or Illinois and tell the farmers how to exterminate the grasshopper?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is the proposition.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give me three minutes?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think we ought to take 20 minutes on this little matter of grasshoppers.

Mr. BLANTON. It may be a little matter to the gentleman from Minnesota because he does not have grasshoppers.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes; we have them in Minnesota, but we take care of them and without the aid of the Federal Government. Mr. Chairman, I will make it 18 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 18 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota. I am familiar with the condition he speaks of. The grasshopper scourge in North Dakota was a very serious one last year and it came unexpectedly. That pest was not limited to North Dakota, for it extended into a part of Minnesota, into my district. In times past there have been various methods of fighting grasshoppers.

Away back in 1873 we had a serious grasshopper pest throughout the whole of the Red River Valley, extending clear down into the district of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], the chairman of this subcommittee. They then invented what was called a "hopper dozer," which consisted of a long, narrow piece of sheet iron, with a wire attached to each end; it was bent upward on the back, so as to resemble a shovel, but something like 24 feet long. This was filled with coal tar. They would hitch a horse to that and drag it over the field and the grasshoppers would jump into it and stick in the tar, and when it was filled they would burn them. The late Prof. Luger, entomologist of the University of Minnesota, was the designer of the instrument. They discovered later on that they had more success fighting grasshoppers by watching the time when the eggs were being hatched out and plowing the ground at the right time, thereby destroying the young. There may be other methods that may be developed by scientific investigation which will be more effectual. I think it is worth while to spend \$25,000 on this particular pest in order that we may fight it more successfully.

This item includes special investigation of the Hessian fly and the chinch bug, but the Hessian fly and the chinch bug, so far as the hard-wheat region of the Northwest is concerned, are not very serious pests. They may be of some local significance, but the grasshoppers cover a very large area when they do come, and they are a hundred times more serious and destructive in their ravages than the Hessian fly or the chinch bug. For that reason it seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has great merit. I know from personal knowledge, talking with people who were in North Dakota through last year, who lost all of their crops, that they suffered great loss. They had the most promising crop of wheat ever known, which would have yielded from 25 to 30 bushels to the acre if allowed to mature. It was totally destroyed, and some of the families that I personally know had to leave the region by reason of the destruction of their crops.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has anybody ever discovered any remedy for the grasshopper?

Mr. STEENERSON. We have discovered the methods that I have just spoken of.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know, but do they get away with the grasshopper?

Mr. STEENERSON. I was just explaining that one way is to plow the ground when the eggs are ready to hatch. They are then exposed and they are then destroyed. Another method is to kill them after they are mature. Undoubtedly by scientific investigation we may find more effective methods. But even with present methods the hoppers have been fought with some success.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did the gentleman ever observe a big field of corn when the chinch bugs were at work?

Mr. STEENERSON. I certainly have. I have seen the chinch bugs both in the wheat and in the corn. They are not so serious with corn as they are with wheat.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, they clean it out.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appeared before the subcommittee framing the Agricultural bill in support of this item, and requested that some provision be made by which the Department of Agriculture would have authority and funds to investigate and direct the forces necessary to exterminate the grasshopper wherever it may appear. I am therefore very much interested in the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for the reason that in the western part of the State of Texas grasshoppers in large numbers invaded the farms and destroyed a large portion of the crops in at least five counties in my district. If a force had been organized in advance to fight this pest, the people of my district and the surrounding districts in my State would have been saved many



thousands of dollars. In my candid judgment the assistance of the Department of Agriculture would have avoided very much of the loss that our people sustained last year.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARRISH. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What sort of relief does the Government grant, or can it grant?

Mr. PARRISH. In reply to the gentleman from Illinois, I will say that the plan is simply this:

The Department of Agriculture will place into the infested areas in charge of this work a sufficient force to perfect an organization of the farmers themselves, advising them where they may obtain the necessary poison and cooperate with them in uniformly prosecuting this work.

Almost without warning great numbers of these insects invaded certain sections of the United States, and unless there is cooperative effort one man can not save his crop from destruction; but if the work is taken in hand in due time under the supervision and direction of scientific men, such as the Department of Agriculture can and will furnish if allowed sufficient funds, the damages usually wrought by these pests will be almost, if not entirely, averted. The grasshopper is not a respecter of county lines, or of State lines for that matter, but have been known, especially in the seventies, to overrun in multitudinous numbers large sections of the country. In 1917, under the appropriation for the stimulation of agriculture provided by Congress, specialists from the Department of Agriculture, by means of a survey, discovered that the eggs of grasshoppers existed in enormous numbers in certain parts of Kansas, and plans were immediately laid to combat the pest. Winter meetings were held throughout the infested regions, and I am informed by the Department of Agriculture that plans were matured for the purchase of materials in sufficient quantities to meet the approaching emergency. This campaign resulted in the distribution of 36,000 pounds of white arsenic and 366 tons of wheat bran used in making poisonous bait and was distributed in eight counties in the State of Kansas. The result of this cooperation meant the saving of 113,000 acres of wheat and 100,000 acres of alfalfa, which in terms of dollars and cents is estimated at \$5,500,000. Similar work, perhaps of a lesser magnitude, was done in California, Nebraska, Arizona, Oregon, Washington, and especially in North Dakota. During 1918-19 in the State of North Dakota a great campaign was inaugurated under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, resulting in the distribution of some 3,000,000 pounds of poison bran, paid for by the farmers themselves at a cost of about \$600,000, the cost to the Federal Government amounting in that instance to but a few thousand dollars, and the State officials of that State estimated that about \$10,000,000 worth of crops were saved from destruction.

The States most often visited by this pest are Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Washington, California, Arizona, and New Mexico, although serious outbreaks have been known to occur in the regions where there is more moisture, and even in the New England States.

From these facts—and I give the Department of Agriculture as authority for them—it will be readily seen that with the investment of a little money a large net saving will result to the American people, and perhaps no appropriation carried in this entire bill will return more real benefit to the farmers and producers of this Nation than the item of \$25,000 asked for in the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota. I therefore express very earnest and sincere hope that the amendment will be adopted and that this small sum at least will be placed in the hands of the proper officials to aid the farmers, who already are face to face with many discouraging, disheartening, and perplexing problems.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young]. During the past summer I had occasion to go through Throckmorton County, in Texas, formerly in the district of my colleague Mr. Jones, but now in the district of my colleague Mr. Parrish. Along the valley of the Clear Fork of the Brazos River I saw fields of corn with stalks higher than the head of a man on horseback, with the remains of what were two and sometimes even three large ears on a stalk, and every single stalk was stripped of every bit of foliage and every vestige of corn was eaten off right down to the cob by grasshoppers, not a thing left of them, just the stalks stripped bare and every little bit on it that could be devoured by a grasshopper was eaten. I saw whole orchards in Throckmorton County that men had spent 10 and 12 years in developing—splendid, fine trees—where the grasshoppers had eaten every leaf and twig,

where they had eaten the peaches right down to the seed, which was left hanging on the limb, and they had also eaten the apricots down to the seeds on the limb and had so eaten the bark on those fruit trees until every tree died and until orchard after orchard was absolutely destroyed—destroyed in just two or three weeks' time by these millions of grasshoppers that came from no man knows where.

Well, if that can happen in Throckmorton County, Tex., in the district of my colleague Mr. Parrish, it can happen all over Texas; it can happen all over North Dakota; it can happen in Minnesota, or it can happen in Missouri, and elsewhere in the United States. And while we are spending money so freely in combating the things that menace agriculture, I think it is as little as we can do to spend this small sum in combating the grasshopper menace. And I am in favor of the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the grasshopper is an emergency proposition. He appears in some years and does not appear in others. There is no way of telling when he is going to appear. There have been worked out new methods by which the outbreaks of grasshoppers, if taken early enough, can be controlled. It is now simply a question of applying the methods that have already been worked out, and that is a matter which I think ought to be done by the States in the counties in which these outbreaks take place. It is merely a question of putting out a poisoned bait, which the grasshoppers eat and which destroys them. There is some advantage in having a leadership in this work, and there have been cases in which the Bureau of Entomology has furnished the experts necessary for this sort of organization. It may be that there will be outbreaks of the grasshopper next year and that some organization and the use of some men from the department may be desirable, but I do not think it is necessary to appropriate \$25,000 for this purpose. That sum seems to me out of all proportion to what the Federal Government ought to be required to do. I do not feel justified in consenting, so far as I am concerned, to an appropriation of \$25,000 for this purpose.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Is it not the gentleman's view that if we recognize this now as a function which we ought to undertake next year that we will have an increased demand for the work in the years to come, and that we are starting a movement that will not stop if Congress takes this action?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it might be desirable to make a small appropriation if there was a way to confine this thing. But I do not think it is necessary, on the basis of a possible outbreak of grasshoppers next year, to appropriate \$25,000.

Mr. FESS. This is a method by which these bills are largely increased from year to year.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Do I understand the gentleman to say the Government has discovered a poison or bait with which to kill off the grasshoppers when they invade a territory like the gentleman from Texas mentioned?

Mr. ANDERSON. There are means of control which have been discovered and which can be used at the beginning of the outbreak, and which will destroy the grasshopper.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The Department of Agriculture has the information available and will give it to any section of the country that may want it on a moment's notice?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I presume the information was sent to the chairman, as well as to the gentleman from Texas, showing it to be the policy of the department to confine this to expert direction. None of it will be used to buy the poison.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have not seen a copy of the letter which the gentleman refers to. But in any event I do not feel it is necessary to appropriate \$25,000 for this purpose.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Can this poison that will kill the grasshopper be bought at any drug store?

Mr. ANDERSON. As to that I can not say. Of course, it is to some extent a matter of method and a matter of using the bait effectively. It can be used in such a way as to be absolutely useless.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Does it take an expert to apply it to grasshoppers?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think better results would come from the utilization of expert advice and experience. I am trying to be entirely frank with the gentleman and with the House. Of course, it is no more to me than to other gentlemen as to what is done in respect to this item.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am asking for information. Of course, it is new to me, as to many other Members of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it is necessary to appropriate \$25,000.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Does the gentleman think it necessary to appropriate any amount?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not object to a moderate amount for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 32, noes 23.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting citrus and other tropical and subtropical plants, and for investigations and control of the Mediterranean and other fruit flies, in cooperation with the Federal Horticultural Board, \$51,500.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATSON: Page 50, line 12, after the word "plants," insert "strawberry beetle, insects indoors, including the rose midge."

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I now offer an amendment, because the chairman of the committee advised that this is the proper section. It seems that every insect and every bug mentioned in the dictionary is placed in this bill, with the exception of the bugs that I have named. They have been in this country a sufficient time to be naturalized.

These particular insects also should be investigated. There is no item and no section in this bill providing for the investigation of indoor insects, and if the rose grower or those who cultivate flowers under glass should ask for an investigation regarding insects indoors there is no provision provided in this bill. The appropriation is not increased by my amendment. It would be an advantage to the rose grower and the greenhouse florist to have this amendment favorably acted upon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is wholly unnecessary to designate the particular bugs which are designated in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON]. The language as it is now in the law is sufficiently broad to permit investigations of the character which he has in mind, and I can see no good purpose which would be served by including the language which he suggests.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Is there any provision here for making investigations concerning insects indoors?

Mr. ANDERSON. The very insect that the gentleman is asking to have investigated has been investigated under this item.

Mr. WATSON. I understood the rose midge has never been investigated.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preventing spread of moths, Bureau of Entomology: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the continued spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths by conducting such experiments as may be necessary to determine the best methods of controlling these insects; by introducing and establishing the parasites and natural enemies of these insects and colonizing them within the infested territory; by establishing and maintaining a quarantine against further spread in such manner as is provided by the general nursery-stock law, approved August 20, 1912, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the importation of nursery stock and other plants and plant products, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests, to permit and regulate the movements of fruits, plants, and vegetables therefrom, and for other purposes," in cooperation with the authorities of the different States concerned and with the several State experiment stations, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, \$400,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, under the act approved August 20, 1912, and the amendment placed on the last Agricultural appropriation bill in regard to this matter how does the department work that out? Is it working out with good effect?

Mr. ANDERSON. The committee did not go into that proposition at all. I can not answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. RAKER. One other question: Where is the large destruction that is taking place by the gypsy and the brown tail moth?

Mr. ANDERSON. I understood that new infections are in New Jersey and New York.

Mr. RAKER. And this was caused by imported stock?

Mr. ANDERSON. Originally; yes.

Mr. RAKER. I thank the gentleman.

I just want to call the attention of the committee to this item. I think it is a justification for other items which follow. This is all for privately owned land and trees in these particular States to protect their privately owned forests. It was caused by virtue of allowing one or two importers, who had only as the largest amount of their investment from \$60,000 to \$100,000 involved, but millions of dollars' worth of property has been destroyed, trees that were historic in those States had to be cut down, and the Government is trying to protect those trees of the Eastern States by providing the spray test, and so forth.

Following this, when the first appropriation went on, Congress passed the nursery stock quarantine act, and then a very substantial amendment was passed on the last agricultural appropriation bill. The only mistake in the original bill was that it did not require the fumigation of the imported plants and stock, as it does on interstate shipments and interstate trade. Under the law a man now has to mark on his package to whom he is going to send his nursery stock and what it is, and then it is sent to a station, and there, if they find any insects on it, it is fumigated, and if they can not cure it he is notified and it is destroyed.

This whole industry in the East, the tree industry, was infected by this importation. I just wanted to call the attention of the committee to this item, as there is another item going to follow relating to the industry of 17 Western States, where but a small appropriation has been given heretofore, but where hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property is involved, and where we ought to give the Government protection, and give this wonderful bureau an extension not only in the East but in the West, and apply the same remedies in one place as we apply in the other.

I am speaking now in defense of the item relating to the destruction of predatory animals and rodents, hoping that the committee, when we come to that item, will place a sufficient amount on the appropriation bill, so that the great live-stock industry and the agricultural industry of the West may be given some care and consideration by the experts who have been doing such splendid work along this line heretofore, to the end, first, that hundreds of thousands of acres of lands planted by the farmers may not be destroyed by being overrun with rodents; and at the same time that the stockman, who has given his time and attention to his herd, may not have it destroyed by the predatory animals; and third, that those animals that have been raised and reared in the forest reserves and have become infected with rabies and thereby destroyed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Up until the last year—and to some extent it is breaking out again—there was a disease among the coyotes and other wild animals known as rabies. That has spread all over the country. The amount appropriated was not sufficient. The Health Service of the Federal Government came to the aid of those Western States. The States that always have an emergency fund of this kind used up their emergency fund, as well as various counties, so that the amount of increase requested by the Biological Survey for that kind of work ought to be given, so that the work that has been started and has been in operation for the last six years may be continued in its efficiency, so that results may be had, and we shall not be sliding back instead of going ahead, as we ought to.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVEY. I move to strike out the last word. I wish to suggest for the consideration of the House a few thoughts in connection with the whole subject of insects and their spread and the means of controlling them. As I have listened to some of the remarks made here to-day, I have wondered whether some of the Members of the House realize the gigantic importance of this proposition. In the original condition of America we had the forests and all the natural relations of the various forms of life. We had the insect-eating birds, and they had their homes in the forests, so that nature maintained a nice balance between the various conflicting forms of life. The subjugation of America by the processes of civilization has changed the original order of things. To a large extent we have destroyed the natural balance that existed, the thing which nature designed to maintain the proper relation between the various forms of life. To a large extent we have destroyed the habitations of the insect-eating birds, and therefore we have destroyed to that degree the power of nature to control by natural means the spread of insects. Moreover, the importation of large quantities of nursery stock—a desirable thing, but which has been conducted under rather careless conditions in the past—has brought into this country many new insects and plant diseases. I might refer briefly to that common pest known as the San Jose scale. According to the best information, it was brought from China. Under its natural conditions there it was held down and did comparatively little harm; but here in America, where it thrives so rapidly, it has no natural enemies. Therefore we must adopt artificial means to control it. I wish that the Members of the House would recall instances that they have witnessed in the last 15 or 20 years where whole orchards have been wiped out because of this insect, the San Jose scale. And then, I wish to call the attention of the Members to the fact that to-day orchards can be preserved and are preserved against this pest, and all because science has done its job, and a big one. The work of the Bureau of Entomology and kindred institutions has made it possible to save to the Nation its great apple industry by working out the means of effective control of this insect enemy. The reference that has been made to experts here this afternoon struck me as rather harsh, because I have seen the services rendered to my country by scientists. I do not pose as a scientist myself, but I have observed their work and the results of it. This Bureau of Entomology in its various activities is one of the most important and vital in the whole Government service. And let me say this, gentlemen, that if the insects were left uncontrolled, it would be only a short time until they could wipe out all vegetation. Human life itself depends absolutely upon the existence of vegetation. The Bureau of Entomology, dealing with insect enemies of trees and vegetation, also deals indirectly with the continuation of human life.

I have in mind the next paragraph, pertaining to the corn borer. I doubt if very many whose attention has not been called directly to this pest realize its dangerous character. It is an insect of foreign importation. It was first observed in New England, and it has done such terrific damage that every scientific man is alarmed. It is spreading westward, and if the corn borer ever strikes the great corn belt of the West, you may say good-bye to one of the greatest industries of America, the growing of corn. I wish that it might be possible for me to carry home to the Members of this House the utter importance, the vital necessity of granting adequate appropriations to this Bureau of Entomology. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas make the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I withdrew the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Entomology, \$1,574,940.

Mr. OSBORNE and Mr. WHITE of Kansas addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. OSBORNE].

Mr. OSBORNE. I move to strike out the last word.

Along the line which has been so interestingly and strikingly discussed by the gentleman who preceded me [Mr. DAVEY] in regard to insect pests, I wish to say that I presume many Mem-

bers of the House are familiar with the ravages of the white cottony cushion scale, which attacks citrus trees. About 40 years ago this scale attacked the orange groves of California. As its name indicates, it is in the form of an animate little white cushion, which attaches itself to the bark of the citrus tree, and inside it there are hundreds of thousands of little eggs. These hatch out and produce further cushions. I can remember very well the first time I looked into the matter over 35 years ago. I went into what was then the largest and oldest orange orchard in southern California—the Woolfskill orchard, in the city of Los Angeles. This cottony cushion scale had covered the trees, so that they looked as though there had been a snow-storm, and they took the life out of the tree. Some men of scientific attainments went to Australia and brought back a parasite, a sort of ladybug, one stage of the cycle of whose life was in the form of a little grub. These grubs would work under the cottony cushion scale and, possessed of a voracious and insatiable appetite, they would eat out the eggs. That ladybug actually eradicated this white cottony cushion scale in a very short time, which otherwise would have destroyed every orange tree in California. It was perfectly apparent that the orchards were doomed until this parasite was introduced. It was one of the most remarkable instances of the preservation of a great industry by the scientific introduction of a parasite adapted to the purpose that has occurred in this country. Nowadays the parasite has disappeared. Once in a while, however, there will be a recrudescence of the cottony cushion scale. Very soon after the parasite appears on the scene and attacks the scale and cleans it all up. It is one of the most wonderful things in nature that ever has come to my attention. I presume, however, that I am saying nothing new in calling it to the attention of Members.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas rose and was recognized by the Chair.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DAVEY. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make that 10 minutes?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. We are not making any progress on the bill; and while I desire to give gentlemen all the time possible to discuss items of the bill, we must make some progress. We have been over four days on the bill.

Mr. DAVEY. Yes; but the gentleman will perhaps concede that this is of some importance.

Mr. ANDERSON. We have passed the corn-borer item. We have read out the total for the Bureau of Entomology. We have passed the corn-borer paragraph.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Is it too late to discuss it?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have no objection to the gentleman asking questions.

Mr. DAVEY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Is the corn-borer paragraph, line 4, page 52, subject to amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. We have passed that part of the bill.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I think the Chairman is in error. The gentleman from Kansas rose at the conclusion of the reading of that paragraph, but the reader read on and read the totals for the Bureau of Entomology. No man could humanly get recognition before he read it. I do not think that is fair to cut a man off on that kind of a ruling. I am not interested and do not want to make a speech, but I think the gentleman ought to have the right to offer an amendment.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that I have been recognized by the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee how long the corn borer has been ravaging the cornfields of that section of the country where it now exists.

Mr. ANDERSON. As far as we know, it probably came into the country in 1909 or 1910, but it was not discovered that the borer was an imported insect until 1917, when the discovery was made in Massachusetts in the vicinity of Boston.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Predicating my remarks on the inquiries of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DAVEY], I want to state to the committee my recollection was that this item was stricken out a year ago. A member of the committee informed me that it was reduced.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is not correct.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I want to state to this committee that in my section of the State of Kansas, and throughout the State,

the corn borer, a root worm very much like this and which, I believe, is identical with it, has infested the cornfields of Kansas and Nebraska and Iowa periodically for 40 years. It is met successfully and only so through the alternation of crops. It looks exactly like this corn borer. I thought it possible and entirely probable that it was the same insect that has been discovered in the cornfields of the New England States. I may be in error. I have no purpose to move to strike out the paragraph, but I am disposed to think from what I have heard of the ravages committed that the efforts of the department to eradicate it have been futile and will continue to be so until they thoroughly understand the habits of the insect, and that it can be met by the alternation of crops, as it is in many parts of the West.

Mr. ANDERSON. This worm appears mostly at the root or lower part of the stalk and bores into the corn and destroys it. They also come up into the ear. I understand that the investigations have been made in both Kansas and Iowa of the particular bug that the gentleman is talking about. That is a bug that has been in the country for many years. It is not the same bug that has been found in Massachusetts. The one found in Massachusetts is an imported bug or worm that came into the country as we think in 1909 or 1910. The two worms are not the same at all.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DAVEY] may have 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks that his colleague [Mr. DAVEY] be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio can get time in the regular way, and therefore I feel constrained to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to say that he has no desire to cut off anyone from offering an amendment, and while the Clerk has read a line beyond the paragraph mentioned, the Chair recognizes that the gentleman from Ohio was on his feet to get recognition, and the Chair will now recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DAVEY] to offer an amendment.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 3, after the word "expenses," strike out the figures "\$275,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I hope that it may be possible for us to view all problems of this kind in a national sense. The European corn borer does not at present threaten the district which I represent, but it does threaten the great eastern section of this country, and if it is not controlled it will threaten the entire Nation. I am in full accord with the policy of retrenchment in expenses. It seems to me that nothing could be more necessary and advisable than saving money on the part of the Government at the present time. But there are places where apparent economy may be a most foolish thing and may be of the most expensive character, and this I think is one of them. Your country and mine faces an emergency with reference to the imported and highly dangerous insect—the corn borer. Scientists tell me that it is spreading faster and faster, having started in New England, and is now moving westward through New York State. They find it here and there. It absolutely destroys the corn that it attacks.

It is my earnest hope that I may emphasize the utter importance of doing something to stop it now. Every year that you postpone this thing will make it more dangerous and more expensive. You gentlemen from the great corn belt would better take heed. This insect, if it ever strikes the corn belt of the United States, will practically wipe it out.

I want to give testimony to the great value of the Government work in connection with all insects of economic importance. I remember studying some years ago a Government bulletin with reference to the elm-leaf beetle. The subject was covered in the most simple and understandable language. It told the life history of the elm-leaf beetle, told its habits, and gave a remedy for it. That was the result of Government appropriations to find out by investigation its life history and the time and means by which it could be best controlled. It was there just as clear as day for the benefit of the people of the Nation, and if they wished to control the scourge that was then sweeping over the entire eastern part of the country they could do it by simple measures.

That is one phase of the work, but this matter of the corn borer is another thing; it is an emergency; and I understand that the department has asked for \$400,000. I imagine that if they told you what is in their hearts they would ask for a million dollars, knowing as they do the terrific danger that threatens this country from the spread of this insect enemy.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVEY. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. Has the Government ever effectively controlled any insect pest?

Mr. DAVEY. Does the gentleman mean by that, exterminated it?

Mr. HUSTED. I mean brought it under control so that it would cease to be a serious menace?

Mr. DAVEY. I would say yes to that.

Mr. HUSTED. But the gentleman is in some doubt about it?

Mr. DAVEY. On the broad basis, no. It is difficult to absolutely eradicate, but I referred a little while ago to the San Jose scale. The Government has shown the way whereby that scale may be controlled and the orchards of this Nation are saved by virtue of the work done by the Government. The great State of Massachusetts has very largely controlled, although it has not exterminated, the brown-tail and gypsy moth. There are many other insects which the Government has shown the way to control—where they have actually worked out the methods of control and given the facts to the Nation broadcast.

Mr. HUSTED. Is it not a part of experience that those things come and go even without any particular effort as to eradication? They come some years and last for a year or two, and then pass away, and other things come to take their places, various forms of blights and pests.

Mr. DAVEY. Yes. The chestnut blight, for instance, eradicated itself after it had eliminated the chestnut trees. It destroyed the chestnut trees of the eastern part of this country.

Mr. HUSTED. And the Government did nothing to check it?

Mr. DAVEY. The Government started too late, and perhaps it could not have accomplished anything in that case, anyway; but here we have a sudden emergency and I am pleading for enough money to handle it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DAVEY] is unquestionably well informed upon the general question of insect pests, and the means and methods for controlling them; but I think he has perhaps not gone into this particular question. This insect was originally imported, it was thought, into this country in 1909 in shipments of broom corn. These shipments were made quite broadly over the United States, but for the most part in the New England States and in the State of New York. The presence of the pest and its European origin was not discovered until 1917, when it was discovered in Massachusetts. Shortly after that another infestation was found in the vicinity of Albany, N. Y. Appropriations were made by the State of New York and the State of Massachusetts for its eradication, and a very large appropriation was made by the Federal Government. It was thought at that time that the expenditure of considerable sums of money and a very energetic course of action on the part of those in charge of the work might result in wholly eradicating the pest. Eradication work was, however, not very well conducted.

Mr. RUBEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not now. An attempt was made to eradicate the insect in the middle of the infested area. Of course, if that had been accomplished it would have been of very little use because the section would immediately have been reinfested from the outside.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I prefer first to finish my statement. Eradication measures were not successful. Within the last year new infestations have been found in western New York in the vicinity of Buffalo and across the river in Ontario. It is perfectly clear now, I am told by the authorities in the Department of Agriculture, that it is not going to be possible to eradicate this pest in the New England States.

The proposition, therefore, resolves itself down into three classes of work—investigational work for the purpose of determining methods of growing corn notwithstanding the pest, including studies of its life history, the introduction of its natural enemies from the sections of Europe from which it came, and, thirdly, the quarantining of the sections in which it now is, in order that it may not spread into the corn-belt section of the country.

I went into this matter to a considerable extent, because I appreciate the importance of the insect and I appreciate what



It may do if it gets into the corn belt of the country; but my investigation into the matter led me to the conclusion—and I am supported in that conclusion by gentlemen who rank very high in the Department of Agriculture—that the sum of money which we have appropriated is amply sufficient to put into effect the control measures which are necessary in order to keep these insects in the section where they now are. If we were to undertake to exterminate—and I do not believe it is possible to exterminate it in this area—we would have to appropriate not only the \$500,000 the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DAVEY] proposes, or the million dollars that he suggested, but much larger sums. I think we ought to appropriate the sums necessary to do the things that are humanly possible to do in controlling this insect, but I do not think we ought to appropriate another dollar beyond that sum. The work which it is necessary to do in investigating the life history of the pest and the methods of controlling the insect in the sections where it is are provided for under other items of the bill, as is also the proposition for importing its natural insect enemies. The only purpose for which we can spend money properly from now on is in quarantine measures and measures of control directed toward keeping the insect in the localities in which it is now established. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Salaries, Bureau of Biological Survey: Biologist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$4,000; chief clerk and executive assistant, \$1,800; administrative assistant, \$2,250; executive assistant, \$1,800; executive clerk, \$1,980; clerks—3 of class 4, 6 of class 3, 1 \$1,500, 14 of class 2, 1 \$1,260, 15 of class 1, 2 at \$1,100 each, 1 \$1,080, 3 at \$1,000 each; preparators—1 \$1,200, 1 \$900; photographer, \$1,300; game warden, \$1,200; messenger, \$720; messenger boys—1 \$600, 1 \$480; laborer, \$720; 2 charwomen at \$240 each; in all, \$81,070.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do that for the purpose of going back and discussing the corn-borer item. I was opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DAVEY] and I want to express my views on that question.

A year ago when we had the appropriation bill in this House I offered an amendment for an appropriation for the sum of \$500,000 to be spent in eradicating this corn borer. That amendment did not pass in the House, but it went on in the Senate. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have studied carefully the reports made by the Department of Agriculture and the work they have been trying to do. In my opinion they have used a method radically wrong in the expenditure of the money which we gave them in the appropriation bill of last year. Instead of going into those infected territories and destroying the borer and getting rid of it, they have gone in there and spent a whole lot of money in studying the bug itself, to find out its habits and find out what it feeds on, and all that sort of thing. I think that they should have gone there and done as they did with the pink boll weevil in the South, destroyed and gotten rid of it. I believe if they had pursued that policy they would have accomplished a whole lot more than in the policy they have pursued with this appropriation. In view of that I am opposed to increasing the appropriation more than is carried in this bill, of \$275,000. I believe with that much money and with the cooperation of the States of New York, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire, that are affected, if they will pursue the right sort of method they can eradicate it, but as long as they spend the money in studying the habits of the insect and what it feeds on, and all that sort of thing, they are going to waste a whole lot of money. I want the department to go up there and eradicate the corn borer. I desired to express my sentiments and my position, and let it go into the Record, so that, if it is worth anything, the Department of Agriculture may know my attitude. I am not opposed to the work. I want the corn borer eradicated.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, I think I owe it to the House to say a few words in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY]. Perhaps he may not understand the importance of studying the life history of an insect enemy. The purpose of doing that is to find the most effective time and place for striking it. There are certain insects that almost baffle control, and yet after careful study the scientists are able to develop the facts with reference to those particular insects. I referred a few moments ago to the elm-leaf beetle, and I want to explain that, because I think it illustrates the whole thing. If, for instance, you would go into an infested area that was stricken with the elm-leaf beetle, say in the month of July, and attempt to eradicate it, as my distinguished friend from Missouri says you would have an impossible job, prac-

tically. Science, on the other hand, has shown that the time and place to control the elm-leaf beetle is just at the time the eggs are hatched. The adult beetle lays a cluster of eggs on the under side of the elm leaf, and early in June those eggs start to hatch. By the application of the right kind of poison, arsenate of lead in spray form, at that particular time, you destroy the whole new brood, practically. And the same thing will apply to almost any other insect. In order to combat it effectively, it is necessary to study its life history and find out what it feeds upon, to find out the time and place where it can be hit most effectively, so that its control may be more easy and within reach of mankind. Science in this matter does an infinitely bigger and more important job than most people realize.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and other animals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry; for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with rearing fur-bearing animals; for experiments, demonstrations, and cooperation in destroying wolves, coyotes, prairie dogs, gophers, ground squirrels, and other animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, and wild game; and for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies in predatory wild animals, \$452,240.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HUDSPETH: Page 54, line 5, after the word "animals," strike out the figures "\$452,240" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$600,000."

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this is an amendment that ought to appeal to the business sense of this entire committee. I want to state to the gentlemen who are not familiar with this work that since the United States Government has instituted this character of work, according to the report of the Biological Survey, \$300,000,000 worth of forage has been saved; \$200,000,000 worth in foodstuffs, and between thirty and forty million dollars in live stock. The Government has expended since it instituted this work about \$1,500,000. Of this sum \$240,000 has been paid back through the sale of the skins of the fur-bearing animals destroyed.

I want to state to my friends from the West—and I am now appealing to the chairman of the Agricultural Committee—that it shows that 15,000,000 acres of Government land has been gone over through the West and the prairie dog poisoned. I do not know whether you gentlemen are familiar with the habits of the prairie dog or not, but I want to state that 30 years ago in western Texas, in my district, and particularly in the district of my colleague Mr. BLANTON, the largest towns were the prairie-dog towns. They destroyed acres upon acres of grass. I do not understand, I want to state to my friend from Minnesota, Mr. ANDERSON, why this appropriation was cut down. I want to state, gentlemen, that in Texas—

Mr. ANDERSON. The appropriation has not been cut down.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It has been cut down \$3,800 from the last appropriation.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman ought to know that it is a transfer from the lump sum to the statutory roll.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am taking the report. That shows that the appropriation has been cut down \$3,800 from the appropriation of last year. Now, the Secretary of Agriculture asked for \$600,000. The estimate of this bureau, the Biological Survey, was \$882,000. I want to state to my friend from Minnesota that this is a revenue-producing proposition. Texas is not clamoring so much for this amendment, except that we are restocked from the forest reserves in New Mexico. Texas, through her own appropriations, made by the State legislature, has practically eradicated the wolf in a large portion of that great State. By doing so, I want to state to my friends from the East, lands that were on the tax rolls 10 years ago in western Texas at \$1 and \$1.50 an acre, are now assessed at \$5 and \$6 an acre. Why? Because the wolf has been eradicated, and the sheep are turned loose to graze on the prairies of western Texas without herders.

The same thing, gentlemen, can be said of Arizona and New Mexico if you eradicate the wolf. I say it is a revenue-producing measure. The work of this Biological Survey covers the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, North and South Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas, Utah, Nevada, California, Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Texas. It covers the entire West. I say to you, gentlemen, that the Biological Survey asked for \$882,000. We are asking in this appropriation for an increase of \$146,000 to continue

this work. When you destroy the wolf and other rodents, then the work is completed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Where does the gentleman get his figures of \$882,000?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I get them in the report of the Biological Survey.

Mr. ANDERSON. That sum has never been appropriated for this purpose.

Mr. HUDSPETH. They are asking for that.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; they have not asked for it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes. They are asking for \$882,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. Where does the gentleman get that?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I get it from the Biological Survey report, I will say to my friend.

Mr. ANDERSON. They have never made such a request, to my knowledge.

Mr. HUDSPETH. They state that the Senate cut it down to \$600,000, and you cut it—the Committee on Agriculture—cut it to \$442,000. You cut it \$3,800 below the appropriations of last year.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. We did not cut it at all. We simply transferred some people from the lump-sum appropriation to the statutory roll. You are only taking part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to have 5 minutes, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] to have 5 minutes, and—

Mr. RAKER. And I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman from California has already had five minutes. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I will state to my friend that on page 14 of your report it is shown that this appropriation was decreased \$3,800 from the appropriation of last year. There is your own report. That is \$3,800 below the appropriation of last year. There is a total sum for this work, for studying the methods and habits of animals and birds and for the work of destroying predatory animals. It is a total sum. But I say it is decreased \$3,800, when the Secretary of Agriculture asked for an increase of \$153,000 and the bureau asked for an appropriation of \$882,000.

You gentlemen have increased the appropriation for the destruction of the pink bollworm, and I agree to it. You have just adopted an amendment to the bill appropriating \$25,000 to eradicate grasshoppers or to seek some method of eradicating grasshoppers. This is as important as any other amendment that will be offered here. It is on a parity with the destruction of the pink bollworm. When you destroy the wolf you enhance the value of Government land in the West anywhere from \$5 to \$10 an acre, as has been done in Texas.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. To what extent has the wolf been eradicated in Texas?

Mr. HUDSPETH. To the extent that we turn our sheep loose in the pastures without harm.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, as to what the States and individuals themselves have done toward this matter, I want to say that practically every big cowman in my own district and in my colleague's district on the Rio Grande, and every cowman of any consequence in the district of my colleagues, Mr. JONES, Mr. PARRISH, and Mr. GARNER, has had for years a bounty of \$50 that they pay for the scalp of every lobo wolf that can be found and killed in their pastures. They pay that themselves out of their own pockets, and our State has also paid a bounty year after year, varying in amount, sometimes 50 cents and sometimes \$1, for scalps of coyotes; and counties in Texas have also paid bounties.

Mr. HUDSPETH. This report shows that the States cooperated last year with the Federal Government to the extent of \$1,100,000. The Biological Survey so reports.

Mr. BLANTON. And so far as prairie dogs are concerned, mentioned by my colleague, the cattlemen went to the expense themselves of exterminating them. Take the district of my colleague, Mr. HUDSPETH, with over 400 miles of Rio Grande border in it, with Mexico just across a little stream, so small that in many places you can walk across it. What is the use of the cattlemen spending all of their time and attention in exterminating these animals on their own ranches unless everybody else around them does likewise?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished friend yield to me for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. RAKER. The question is this: If the destruction of the wolf has the effect that the gentleman says it has, and it does, would not the destruction of the California lion and coyote have the same effect on the industries of the State where these animals are prevalent?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. You take the catamount or the bob-tailed cat, as well as the regular wild cat with a long tail. They get large enough and strong enough not only to kill lambs and pigs but in many instances even to kill calves, and unless the Government does assist in this matter, in the destruction of these predatory wild animals, it is a matter that concerns every one of the Western States and every single one of the States that border on the South. It is a matter, I think, that we could well spend this money on, and I am as careful, I think, as any other man in this House in watching the money that goes out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. STEVENSON. Is there any way provided to keep them from coming over from Mexico? You have a great deal of trouble in that way, too, do you not?

Mr. BLANTON. Only to kill them when they come. The quarantine does not amount to anything, and that is one reason why the Government should help. The cattlemen have gone as far as they can go themselves. If you can kill a lobo wolf in my district or in the district of my friend [Mr. HUDSPETH], you will be paid \$50 by the cowman on whose land you kill it. They kill them themselves, at their own expense, because they are interested in getting these animals exterminated, but they migrate constantly; and I say that the money that the Government expends is very inconsequential and well spent compared with the money that the individuals themselves spend and that the individual States spend for these purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it does seem to me that if there is any one item in this bill where a small appropriation is penny-wise and pound-foolish it is in this very item of the destruction of predatory wild animals. You all know that there are something like 175,000,000 acres of forest reserves in the Western States. These forest reserves are being used for grazing purposes and the stockmen who use them have to pay an annual tax for the grazing of their stock upon these forest reserves. In my home State there are over a million sheep in the forest reserves, most of them in my district, and about 375,000 head of cattle and over 8,000 horses. We pay a very large amount of money to the Government every year for grazing that stock on the forest reserves, and all the other States of the West do the same thing.

Those forest reserves belong exclusively to the Government and they are used by the Government for raising revenue. The public, generally speaking, have nothing to do with them, except to pay for grazing stock on them. Now, in all fairness the Government should so supervise and control those preserves that they will not be a menace to the stockmen or the surrounding country. And while the Forest Service officials have done, and are doing, the best they can with their limited appropriation toward the destruction of the hundreds of thousands of mountain lions, wolves, coyotes, and bobcats, and other predatory wild animals that infest those forest reserves, yet the fact remains that the forest reserves cover such vast areas of uninhabited territory, and most of it difficult of access, that the small appropriations are wholly insufficient to do anything like the work that should be done; and while the Bureau of Biological Survey reports that over 25,000 of these animals were killed last year, nevertheless those ferocious animals killed \$20,000,000 worth of live stock throughout the Western States last year.

In fact, the Government forest reserves are to-day simply great breeding grounds for these destructive animals, and I doubt very much whether or not at the present rate and with the



small appropriations that Congress is making each year for this work we are destroying them as fast as they are breeding. They breed very rapidly; coyotes increase about eight a year to each den, and the Government has simply got to sooner or later go at it in a systematic way and appropriate whatever amount of money is necessary to effectively exterminate these animals from the forest reserves, and the sooner we do it the cheaper it will be to the Government itself without even considering the \$20,000,000 of loss each year while the Government is temporizing with the matter every year by making these small appropriations, which hardly amount to 30 cents apiece for a whole township and pursuing this penny-wise and pound-foolish policy. It is not only unbusinesslike and shortsighted and foolish to put off this work from year to year but it is so utterly unjust and unfair to the stockmen who pay the Government for grazing their stock within these wild-animal breeding grounds. If Congress would make the necessary appropriations, as it should and must and will do some day, to go at it in a wholesale and scientific way by shooting, trapping, and poisoning these animals, as can be done, and completely clean them out once and eradicate and exterminate the species, that will settle the matter for all time and the Government will be relieved from this annual expense and the stockmen will be relieved from the frightful loss and hardship. I can speak very definitely on this subject for the State of Colorado. I live in the little city of Glenwood Springs in western Colorado, and have lived there for nearly 35 years. It is almost surrounded by forest reserves. The reserves come down to about a mile and a half of my home town. We have about 14,000,000 acres of forest reserves in the State of Colorado and I have been intimately acquainted and associated with stockmen of that State during all the time I have lived in Colorado, and have been thoroughly familiar with the use of the forest reserves ever since they were created, nearly 20 years ago. During the past year in our State we killed over 2,000 of these animals; the largest number was coyotes. The most destructive and desperate of these animals are the mountain lions and gray wolves. It is estimated that a mountain lion kills 52 animals each year. They live almost entirely upon other animals. An examination of the stomach contents of a large number of these animals killed during the past year showed that 20 of them had eaten horse flesh, that 19 had eaten beef, that 34 of them had eaten sheep, that 3 had eaten pork, 44 had dined on rabbits, 9 of them on poultry, and 4 of them on other birds. The coyote is the most intelligent in many respects of any of those animals. For genuine criminal cunning he has no equal. But the bobcat is a frightfully destructive animal. He differs widely from other wild animals in that he is not afraid of the ranchmen's habitations like most other animals are. A bobcat will go right into a tent or hen-house or sheep shed or any place that is not locked up and grab anything in sight and take the chance on getting away with it. The big gray wolves run in pairs, or three or four of them, and they have the strength and courage and perseverance to down any animal, and they roam all over a wide stretch of country. They travel hundreds of miles, but their main retreat, their place of safety, is their breeding ground back in the reserves, where they are unmolested. That is where they mostly come from and return to.

The States, at least Colorado, are doing their full share. Colorado has nearly always paid a liberal bounty on these animals, and I notice by a Denver newspaper to-day that State Senator Morrison, of my district, has a bill pending before our State legislature, now in session, providing for a \$100 bounty on every mountain lion killed. Besides the State's active work, the counties and stock associations are all doing their full share. Of course, the State and the counties and the stock associations should do a large part of the work necessary to the extermination of these animals on the public domain outside of the forest reserves, and especially on privately owned land, but the United States Government ought to, at its own expense, promptly and effectively and once and for all, clean up these forest reserves and eradicate those animals from the territory that it exclusively controls and charges these stockmen for grazing upon. And as long as Congress pursues this policy of little piecemeal appropriations and of only killing off a few thousand of these animals every year they are going to keep on breeding and increasing and Congress will have to keep on appropriating and the stockmen will have to keep on sustaining this horrible loss. It is an endless chain; and I earnestly appeal to you, gentlemen, on behalf of the stock growers in particular and the development of the West in general to adopt this amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, which we have all agreed upon as necessary and just, and give us this appropriation, and I assure you that every dollar of the money will be economically, hon-

estly, and wisely expended and will go a long way toward relieving the western stockmen from the horrible and discouraging losses they are at present afflicted with every year.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, how much time is there remaining on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Eight minutes.

Mr. RAKER. May I be recognized for four minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] will be recognized for three minutes, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman from California for four minutes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in addition to the destruction of live stock by the predatory animals, such as the wolves and coyotes, I want to call attention to the fact that there is in the Western States what is known as the California lion, that is destructive of horses, cattle, and sheep, and the deer that we preserve in our State.

The coyote is extremely destructive. I want to call attention to the rodents in particular. The national forests—we are not complaining of that now—are very extensive. In the State of California we have a law that requires each individual to free his land of these rodents. If he does not, the board of supervisors, through their agents, take charge of that work, destroys them, and the expense becomes a lien on the land. The land can be sold and the man deprived of his home because he does not destroy the rodents upon his land, when, as a matter of fact, there is a perfect stream or trail of these rodents from the Government land onto his land.

Now, all we ask is that the Government meet the citizens of my State fifty-fifty in the destruction of these rodents. That is nothing but right and fair. It is not a burden on the Government to protect its own property any more than it is on the individual who, if he fails, loses his home. This is but an indication of what can be done. The destruction of crops by the rodent is very extensive. They can practically consume a man's field of 100 acres in two days if it is not cared for. Where the Biological Survey has gone into the work in co-operation with the residents in many of the sections they have practically eliminated and destroyed these rodents, and the man who has planted his crop may have some assurance of a return. That is all we are asking here—that the Government, in addition to the predatory animals, take care of these rodents while they are breeding on the public domain, which constitutes much of the territory in these Western States. We ask that the Government assist its citizens to protect the property of the Government as well as the individuals, so that they may be in a better position to meet their obligations and pay their taxes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is natural for men to feel that those things are the most important which they come most closely in contact with and which they know the most about. I appreciate and sympathize with the feelings of the gentlemen from the West in their desire to increase this item. But, Mr. Chairman, since 1912 this item has increased from \$35,000 to more than \$450,000. With the amount carried on the statutory roll for clerical service that is incident to it, it amounts to more than \$475,000. Considered in its relation to the rest of the appropriations in the bill, I think the item carries a very liberal amount. The service is being very well conducted now, and there is very little reason that we can discover for increasing it under the present circumstances.

I realize the interest of the gentlemen in it, but it is not more important than a great many items in the bill, and it is all, it seems to me, we can reasonably appropriate for that purpose.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman understands that the Government gets the skins of these animals and that it has paid back about one-third of the amount which the Government has paid out.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Government has expended about \$2,000,000 and has got back about \$270,000, so that as a business proposition, from the standpoint of getting back the money invested, it does not seem like a very good investment. I think it is a good work, and it is being satisfactorily done, but it seems to me that the amount of the appropriation represents fairly the contribution which the Federal Government ought to make for that sort of work. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON) there were 30 ayes and 21 noes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers, and, pending that, I make a point of order there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point of order there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. HOSPIETH.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 32 ayes and 39 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to add two other animals to this item, because I do not think the language covers it. After the word "destroying," I move to insert the words "mountain lions," and after the word "coyotes" the word "bobcats."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 54, line 1, after the word "destroying," insert the words "mountain lions," and after the word "coyotes," insert the word "bobcats."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I may say that the bobcat is one of the most cunning and the most fearless of the predatory animals. They have no fear of a human habitation, but will go into a house or a tent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 36, noes 32.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Division of Publication: Chief of division, \$3,500; chief editor, \$3,000; assistant, \$2,500; assistants in charge—1 of exhibits \$3,000, 1 of information \$3,000, 1 of motion-picture activities \$3,000, 1 of illustrations \$2,100, 1 of indexing \$2,000; superintendent of distribution, \$2,500; chief clerk, \$2,000; assistant in exhibits, \$2,000; assistant in document section, \$1,800; assistant editors—3 at \$1,800 each, 1 \$1,600; assistants—3 at \$2,000 each, 2 at \$1,400 each; indexer or compiler, \$1,800; indexer, \$1,400; artist and designer, \$2,500; draftsmen or photographers—3 at \$1,600 each, 2 at \$1,500 each, 2 at \$1,400 each, 1 \$1,300, 10 at \$1,200 each; assistant photographer, \$960; lantern-slide colorist, \$1,200; laboratory aid, \$900; foreman, miscellaneous distribution, \$1,500; clerks—4 of class 4, 3 of class 3, 8 of class 2, 19 of class 1, 18 at \$1,100 each, 52 at \$960 each; 5 machine operators at \$1,200 each; folders—chief \$1,200, 1 \$1,200, 2 at \$1,000 each; messengers or laborers—3 at \$900 each, 10 at \$840 each, 4 at \$780 each, 10 at \$720 each, 3 at \$600 each; 8 skilled laborers at \$1,100 each; messenger boys—8 at \$720 each, 6 at \$600 each, 4 at \$480 each; charwomen—3 at \$480 each, 4 at \$240 each; in all, \$252,180.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There are in the paragraph just read 48 messengers provided for this one particular bureau. As I suggested previously, I intend to make a motion to recommit this bill cutting out all of these surplus messengers and the free-seed item, and my motion, if adopted, will save the Government about \$650,000 every year and will not in any way interfere with the proper functioning of the Government's business. You would never miss anything in the Government's business, and yet we will save \$650,000. In order that my colleagues, through the Record, may be apprised of what they are expected to vote on, because most of them are now absent, I would like them to know what is in this motion and how it applies to the bill, because when it is made, after we get back into the House and they are called here hurriedly from the office building to vote, they will not know what they are asked to vote upon and will be told to vote to support the committee. Therefore, in order that they may know what is in the motion, how much it involves, and how much it will save the Government, and what their responsibility is when they vote against it, because the people are going to hold us responsible for refusing to save money, and it can be saved, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert my motion to recommit in the Record in connection with my remarks.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman is also aware of the fact that they have added 20 new places—1 at \$2,000, 3 at \$1,800, 2 at \$1,600, 1 at \$1,400, 1 at \$1,200, and 12 at \$960?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; 22 new places; but nobody knew that better than the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, and yet he sat still and let this pass in this bill, when by getting up and making a point of order against the items he could have had them stricken out.

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken, for they are not subject to the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Then they are not new positions.

Mr. HAUGEN. They are new, and they have been added to the statutory roll.

Mr. BLANTON. If they are new positions, then why are they not subject to the point of order?

Mr. HAUGEN. Because the organic act creating the Department of Agriculture gives authority to employ clerks, and so forth; so there is authority by law. I am calling the gentleman's attention to the fact that he is objecting to the low salaries.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am not. That is the reason I want this motion to recommit placed in the Record, because the gentleman and other colleagues will then see that I am seeking to strike out 500 of the high-priced messengers and leave 74 of the low-priced messengers in. That is the purpose and intent of my motion to recommit. Therefore, I hope the gentleman, if it goes into the Record, will read it and see exactly how it applies and just exactly how much he can save his country by voting for it, because \$650,000 a year cut off our expenses, while it may not appear large to some of my colleagues, means something in the long run to the taxpaying people.

Mr. HAUGEN. Evidently the gentleman is for increasing the salaries.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am not. The gentleman has not yet understood my proposed motion to recommit.

Mr. HAUGEN. He has raised no objection to the high salaries, but objects to the low salaries.

Mr. BLANTON. No; the gentleman is mistaken. My motion is objecting to the high salaries. Remember, it is the messenger service I am now fighting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that he be allowed to include with his remarks a proposed motion to recommit, for the information of the members of the committee. Is there objection?

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I think I shall, I desire to say that no one knows who is going to make a motion to recommit. One has first to get the recognition of the Speaker; and, while it is not now the practice, yet the practice might grow of Members going around on the floor of the House and getting up and saying that they are going to make a motion to recommit, and asking unanimous consent to put their motion to recommit in the Record. I think it is a bad policy, and therefore I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment? [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. I can read it in that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. RUBEY. I object.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman does not want his colleagues to understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For extra labor and emergency employments in the District of Columbia, \$11,380.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I do it for the purpose of asking the gentleman in charge of the bill if he has a detailed statement as to the expenditures of this item carried in the current law?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I have not a detailed statement of the item.

Mr. HAUGEN. Can the gentleman inform the House what it is appropriated for? Has any part of it been used for the payment of high salaries?

Mr. ANDERSON. I know that two gentlemen were carried on this roll, but they asked to have them transferred to the statutory roll this year, and those transfers were allowed.

Mr. HAUGEN. Were they paid out of this lump sum?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. That was the information they gave us, anyway. They were paid out of this lump sum.

Mr. HAUGEN. Some part of it was expended outside of the District of Columbia, and it was necessary to move them here. It was necessary to make a lump-sum appropriation to take care of this emergency. My understanding is that the funds have been diverted for other purposes, for the payment of high salaries.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman will tell me where he gets that information, I shall be glad to look it up.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for us to hear what is going on between the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Minnesota. I do not know what these gentlemen have their heads together about, but they are evidently conducting some sort of an investigation, and while they are doing that I would like to proceed for five minutes to discuss the future policy of the Democratic Party.



Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think the Democratic Party has any policy.

Mr. BLANTON. Then it is just about in the same fix as the gentleman's party.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa still has the floor.

Mr. WINGO. The gentlemen getting their heads together reminded me of the Democratic Party.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to get any information that the gentleman has about this matter.

Mr. HAUGEN. I asked the question whether the gentleman knows for what purpose the money was appropriated? I know for what purpose it was appropriated, but I do not know for what purpose it has been expended.

Mr. ANDERSON. We do not have a detailed statement of the expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture: For stationery, blank books, twine, paper, gum, dry goods, soap, brushes, brooms, mats, oils, paints, glass, lumber, hardware, ice, fuel, water and gas pipes, heating apparatus, furniture, carpets, and matting; for lights, freight, express charges, advertising, telegraphing, telephoning, postage, washing towels, and necessary repairs and improvements to buildings and heating apparatus; for the purchase, subsistence, and care of horses and the purchase and repair of harness and vehicles, for official purposes only; for the payment of duties on imported articles, and the Department of Agriculture's proportionate share of the expense of the dispatch agent in New York; for official traveling expenses; and for other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for, and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the department, \$161,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to this language in the closing part of the paragraph, beginning on line 9, page 59:

And for other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for.

That is unauthorized by law. It is a general blanket provision under which the Department of Agriculture could spend this \$161,000 for anything in the world it saw fit, if it thought it could use it down there. There is no law for it, and it is wholly unauthorized.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, there is general authority in the law for the purchase of equipment and supplies necessary for the operation of the department. This is simply an appropriation for objects and materials which the department, under general law, is authorized to buy. The language to which the gentleman objects does not extend the paragraph at all. It gives no authority which is not found in general laws authorizing the Department of Agriculture to purchase supplies. The mere fact that it is in general language does not extend the authority of the department in any way. I am satisfied that the Chair will find ample precedent justifying the appropriation under the rule for supplies and equipment for the departments.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the Chair's attention to the following, that under this paragraph of miscellaneous supplies the committee provides for stationery, blank books, twine, paper, gum, dry goods, soap, brushes, brooms, mats, oils, paints, glass, lumber, hardware, ice, fuel, water and gas pipes, heating apparatus, furniture, carpets, and matting; for lights, freight, express charges, advertising, telegraphing, telephoning, postage, washing towels, and necessary repairs and improvements to buildings and heating apparatus, and various other items, and then to wind up, for fear that possibly the department has not authority for buying everything in Washington and everything in New York that it can think of, it asks the committee to give it blanket authority by putting in the language:

And for other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for.

I think it is a matter that is wholly unauthorized by law. It is bad practice, at any rate, for the committee to indulge in, thus giving blanket authority for spending public money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule. The Chair feels that in the organic law creating the Department of Agriculture it is manifest that the intention was to carry forward a work of this kind, and the Chair will base his ruling on a ruling (citation of Jan. 6, 1921) made by Chairman WALSH, a pretty strict interpreter of the rule, in which he says, where a proviso includes the words "and for other needed work and improvement" is in order. The Chair, fortifying his own opinion by the citation referred to, overrules the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the Chair a question? What is the use of reciting any of these articles? Why not just put this one clause in and let it cover all of them?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that there must be in all of these laws a little leeway to take care of all contingencies. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, States Relations Service: Director, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$2,000; clerk or chief accountant, \$2,400; financial clerk, \$2,000; executive clerk, \$1,740; clerk or proof reader, \$1,800; clerks—1 \$1,980, 6 of class 4, 11 of class 3, 2 at \$1,500 each, 20 of class 2, 2 at \$1,320 each, 1 \$1,260, 52 of class 1, 24 at \$1,100 each, 2 at \$1,000 each; clerk or artist-draftsman, \$1,200; clerk or machine operator, \$1,200; messenger, \$1,000; 2 skilled laborers at \$1,000 each; messengers or laborers—2 at \$840 each, 5 at \$720 each, 2 at \$600 each, 1 \$480; messenger boys—4 at \$600 each, 11 at \$480 each; charwomen—4 at \$480 each, 16 at \$240 each; in all, \$196,320.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

This paragraph provides for 26 messengers. I want to appeal to my friend from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] in my request to let my proposed motion to recommit this bill go into the RECORD. It is a small matter; it is a matter that will carry some intelligence to our absent colleagues. The gentleman said I might not get to make the motion. I am going to vote against this bill unless some of its provision are changed.

Mr. RUBEY. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to be opposed to it unless it is changed.

Mr. RUBEY. Are you opposed to it now?

Mr. BLANTON. I am opposed to it right now with the \$360,000 free seeds in it.

Mr. RUBEY. The gentleman has five minutes if he wants to make his speech and tell what he is going to do, but I object to such matters as a motion to recommit getting into the RECORD, which motion the gentleman says he is going to offer when he does not know that he is going to offer it at all. I am going to object to that practice. If the gentleman wants to make a speech and read his proposed amendment, or things of that sort, I will not object.

Mr. BLANTON. As I said before, if this motion to recommit is adopted, it will save this Government \$650,000 a year.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. RUBEY. If the gentleman's motion is adopted and the messengers go out and the department is compelled to pay more money for those that are called clerks to do this work—

Mr. BLANTON. I did not yield for a speech.

Mr. RUBEY (continuing). Under those circumstances he will not save money for the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is not going to puncture my remarks with that kind of talk. [Laughter.] I know that, without hurting the business of this Government one single cent, if this House will adopt my motion to recommit, which will strike out 500 useless messengers and \$350,000 free seeds, it will save the people of this country \$650,000 every year. And if the gentleman from Missouri is not interested in saving that money he can keep his colleagues from knowing all about the motion, and they will do just like he and the rest of them do. Every time a motion to recommit is made and the bell rings they come over hurriedly from the office building, and some door page will tell them it is a motion to recommit and they must stand by the committee, and so they will vote against the motion no matter what it contains, and no matter who makes it, because they do not know what it contains.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I regret I can not. I would like to yield to the gentleman. The gentleman is awfully anxious to keep something out of the RECORD that might enlighten his colleagues, yet he wants to put something in here to encumber or hamper the RECORD. He wants to spend the money of the people of this Government foolishly and extravagantly, and keep on expending it, and when a man comes here and tries to save it for the Government he is always trying to throw obstacles in the way. I will offer the motion when the time comes.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, with the cooperation of other bureaus of the department, and to disseminate useful information on this subject, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, \$50,000.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word, and the gentleman from Arkansas reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman from Arkansas make the point of order?

Mr. WINGO. No; I reserve it.

Mr. FESS. I want to ask the Chairman what is the practice under this particular language of finding "the relative

utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home?"

Mr. ANDERSON. That involves dietetic studies, the use of the respiration calorimeter, and various studies in regard to clothes and their relative wearing qualities, and studies of that kind.

Mr. FESS. Is this money expended on any institution?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. This is the basis of all the home demonstration work in the country. I think it might well be larger than it is. We are expending nearly \$3,000,000 in home demonstration work all over the country, and practically all of the information which is the basis of that home demonstration work is worked out under the language about which the gentleman is inquiring.

Mr. FESS. Does the \$50,000 support the men and women who are sent from place to place?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. It is for work which is done here in the department. It covers investigational work and the preparation of bulletins.

Mr. FESS. All the work is done here as a matter of expert work?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. That is, the scientific research work, the gathering up of information and the putting it in available shape for use in the home demonstration work. That is all embraced in this item.

Mr. FESS. I did not know that was in connection with the home demonstration work. Is the gentleman satisfied with the expenditure of this large amount of money for extension work that we passed a moment ago, amounting to something over a million dollars?

Mr. ANDERSON. I had hoped that that sum might be reduced, and I think it might have been reduced but for one thing. As the gentleman knows, we have just had a new census, and that has changed the ratios of agricultural populations in the different States, upon which the relative proportions of the sums which go to the States are determined. In many States of the Middle West and the Northwest, large States like New York and Pennsylvania and Illinois, the amount which is now being used for extension work furnished by the Federal Government would be actually reduced if the amount this year were not increased by the maturing of \$500,000 under the Smith-Lever Act, and in order to hold that situation level we had to continue the appropriation as it is in the bill.

Mr. FESS. You are not increasing it from year to year?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not in the bill. However, the last installment of the Smith-Lever fund becomes due this year, so that there is appropriated, in addition to the sum appropriated last year, the sum of \$500,000.

Mr. FESS. In the research work are there periodical bulletins sent out, indicating the results of this investigation?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. Bulletins are published and sent out illustrating the results of these investigations.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to exercise my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Bureau of Public Roads: Chief of bureau, \$6,000; purchasing agent, \$2,500; 1 draftsman or clerk, \$1,920; clerks or editorial clerks—1 \$1,600, 1 \$1,200; clerks or photographers—1 \$1,440, 1 \$1,200, 1 \$1,000; clerk or instrument maker, \$1,200; clerk or skilled laborer, \$1,000; instrument maker, \$1,800; model maker, \$1,800; clerks—1 \$1,900, 4 of class 4, 7 of class 3, 3 at \$1,500 each, 6 of class 2, 9 at \$1,320 each, 7 of class 1, 4 at \$1,100 each, 2 at \$1,000 each; 1 mechanic, \$1,680; mechanics—1 \$2,100, 1 \$1,800, 1 \$1,500, 1 \$1,200; skilled laborer, \$1,200; skilled laborer or mechanic, \$840; laboratory aid, \$960; telephone operator, \$720; mimeograph operator, \$840; 2 laborers at \$900 each; messengers or laborers—2 at \$840 each, 2 at \$660 each, 4 at \$600 each; 4 messengers, laborers, or laboratory helpers at \$720 each; fireman, \$720; messenger boys—3 at \$600 each, 8 at \$480 each; 11 charwomen at \$240 each; in all, \$114,460.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in this paragraph concerning this one bureau there are 23 messengers, which, added to the other paragraphs, makes 574 messengers for this one department.

As I said awhile ago, I have prepared a motion to recommit this bill, to try to strike out 500 of these useless messengers. As I said before, that and another item that is in my motion to recommit, if adopted, will save the people of the United States \$650,000 each year; and in order that my colleagues may know what is in my motion before it comes up, in order that I may place the responsibility where it belongs, I again ask unanimous consent, without taking up more of the time of the

House, to attach to my remarks the proposed motion which I intend to make to recommit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to include in his remarks the proposed motion to recommit. Is there objection?

Mr. RUBEY. I object.

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that I have placed the responsibility where it belongs, because the time is going to come, whenever a Member of Congress interferes with any chance for the enlightenment of his colleagues and for the saving of public money, as the gentleman from Missouri has done by his objection to my request when I attempted to inform that Member of Congress, and this House especially, how we can save \$650,000 a year by adopting—

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUBEY. If the gentleman continues to attack the Member from Missouri, he will have to make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. I have moved to strike out the last word in the paragraph, which is the sum of \$114,460.

Mr. RUBEY. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that the gentleman from Texas is not discussing his amendment, and the Chair will admonish the gentleman from Texas to keep within the rule.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have moved to strike out "\$114,460." That is money that comes out of the Treasury. Part of this money is for 23 messengers; and to show that there is a chance to save this money out of this bill I call attention to the motion to recommit, that I wanted my friends and colleagues in the House to understand and to know what it contains before they vote on it; and I have the right, when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] refuses to let his colleagues know what was in my motion, to call his attention to it and call the attention of the people of the country to it, and indicate who was keeping out that information.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman is not talking to the text of his motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will admonish the gentleman from Texas that he should conform to the rules and confine himself to a discussion of his motion.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I put it up to the Chair to determine whether I am not within my rights in discussing the motion to strike out the sum "\$114,460."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman was wandering from the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I will get back to it. I presume the Chair will not take this out of my time. As I said before, in my attempt to save this \$114,460 for the people of the country and to save like items in other paragraphs of this bill I have a motion to recommit. I hope the Members will come around to my office to-morrow morning and let me tell them what is in that motion, because I have tried to put it into the Record, so that you could read it. If I could put it in the Record, all of you would read it.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I can not yield. My friend from Missouri has been so courteous to me in objecting that I must refuse to yield.

Mr. RUBEY. Then I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEVENSON. I move to strike out the last two words. I want to ask what particular function a photographer has in the Bureau of Public Roads?

Mr. CARTER. To take photographs of the roads.

Mr. STEVENSON. Here in line 9, on page 65, is a provision:

Clerks or photographers—1 \$1,440, 1 \$1,200, 1 \$1,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. I take it these gentlemen are blue printers. Mr. STEVENSON. They have draftsmen and engineers, and all that kind of thing. They make blue prints.

Mr. ANDERSON. So do the photographers.

Mr. STEVENSON. Has there been any information given as to what these photographers are doing?

Mr. MONDELL. I imagine these gentlemen occasionally take a picture of a bad road that needs repairing, down in South Carolina and maybe in Wyoming.

Mr. STEVENSON. Everybody knows that they make pictures, but the pictures are entirely inaccurate. They have got civil engineers to make blue prints. That is the way to get at whether a road needs repairing and what repairs are needed. I just want to direct attention to that.



As to this trouble about messengers, if there are too many messengers I would suggest that if my friend will move to strike some of them out, that will give us an opportunity to vote on it. He ought not to waste the time of the House by a motion to recommit. I am ready to vote right now. If it is necessary to strike some of them out, let us do it now.

Mr. BLANTON. As I said to-day, the reason I do not make the motion after each paragraph is that the committee has its adherents here in sufficient number to protect it on almost every proposition you can bring up, and they will vote you down. We have not more than 60 Members on the floor now, out of 435 Congressmen, and most of them would vote to sustain the committee on any proposition that came up.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman has made his speech in my time, but I am entirely with him as to economizing in these matters. But it strikes me that he could make his motion to strike out a lot of these messengers while he is spending the time trying to get his motion to recommit into the Record.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] be allowed five minutes in which to read his motion to recommit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be allowed five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want to read it, Mr. Chairman, I am hoarse.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be allowed five minutes to read his motion to recommit. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, instead of reading it and taking up the time, as I am hoarse from much talking, I ask unanimous consent that I may put it in the Record in connection with my remarks.

Mr. RUBEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] for the purpose of getting some information. I have enjoyed all this, but I want to get some facts. With reference to these messengers I would like to have the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] advise me if the information given on numerous occasions in years past is correct that the reason why they employ so many messengers in the Department of Agriculture is that if they were to call for clerks from the Civil Service Commission they would have to employ a great many more high-priced employees? That is the information I have received on other occasions when this bill has been under consideration, and I would like to know if that is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. They could do away with these messengers if they had places for clerks, but if they did not have places for clerks the work would have to go undone. The work done by these messengers, which is necessary, would not be done, and the work of the department would be greatly impeded.

Mr. WINGO. Here is the point I was getting at. A few years ago when this matter was being considered on the floor of the House I was a young inexperienced Member and felt that on my young shoulders alone rested the duty of protecting the Treasury, and I thought I had discovered a place for a little economy. So I got up here and ranted around for two or three days about spending so much money for messengers. The gentleman no doubt recalls my energetic efforts.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman then in charge of this bill, Mr. Lever, of South Carolina, very patiently explained to me that they had provided for so many messengers because under the law the pay of messengers is smaller than the pay of clerks and that messengers could do the work, and therefore I found that I was misguided in my efforts, and that instead of economizing I would really increase the public expenditures if I cut out messengers and increased clerks, so I subsided. There has been no change in the law, has there, since then?

Mr. ANDERSON. No change whatever.

Mr. TINCHER. Did you offer a motion to recommit?

Mr. WINGO. Oh, I did everything of that kind and really believed I was forcing economy. I was young and green then. [Laughter.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I want to ask the chairman if he recalls when this Bureau of Public Roads was created?

Mr. ANDERSON. I can not state exactly; the Office of Public Roads has been established for many, many years.

Mr. FESS. I am not interested in the particular time, but I wondered why the salary of the chief is made higher than any other chiefs of the Agricultural Department?

Mr. ANDERSON. Three or four years ago the chief of the bureau died. We were then coming to the proposition of spending several hundred million dollars for the construction of roads. It was apparent to everybody that we ought to have a man at the head of the Bureau of Public Roads, directing the expenditure of the money and passing on the contracts, of a very high class and of great ability. The department tried to get a man at the statutory salary, but did not succeed. Finally the committee put into the bill the provision carrying \$6,000 as the salary of the chief of the bureau. After an explanation on the floor of the House a point of order was withdrawn against it and it was permitted to remain in the bill, and the gentleman who is now occupying the position accepted the position at the salary of \$6,000. He is an extraordinarily good man, a civil engineer, and is worth more than \$6,000.

Mr. FESS. I raised the question to make this observation: That the Department of Agriculture is really an aggregation of bureaus headed by great experts. I think the man at the head of the Bureau of Chemistry is not only a leading chemist of the country but succeeded one of the leading chemists of the country. Here is an expert in one of these departments that receives \$5,000. On the other hand, here is a road builder—

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is mistaken, he is not a road builder; he is one of the high-class civil engineers of the country. There were two men that the Secretary of Agriculture was anxious to get; each of them was receiving in private practice \$10,000 a year. It was only because of his willingness to sacrifice his private practice and come into the Government service and give his experience that we were able to get him for this amount.

Mr. FESS. I am grateful to the gentleman from Illinois for making the statement, for evidently the man is not paid simply because he is a road builder, but because he is an expert along other lines.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will say that no point of order was raised against it for the reason, as the gentleman from Minnesota suggests, that at the particular time we were all very much interested in road building, and in that way our objection to an increase in salary was overcome. I wish we could in some way induce a similar interest in respect to the work done by a number of other bureaus, because they are splendid men, of exceptional ability, who have proved the value of their work to the Government and who deserve more pay than they are getting. In some way we ought to provide for an increase.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words, in order to ask a question. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has insisted, with a great degree of vehemence, that the number of messengers carried and provided for in this bill is excessive. I would like to ask if the committee has recently investigated the work that is performed by these employees, with a view to determining whether or not they are as a matter of fact excessive in number?

Mr. ANDERSON. In a general way. It is impossible in a short session for any committee to take up the statutory roll and go into the record of each employee and ascertain whether he is necessary or unnecessary. In general, however, the department itself is recognizing the possibility of reducing the number of messengers in this bill, and they have been largely reduced. It must always be remembered that many are employed as messengers or laborers, and in nine cases out of ten they are not messengers but laborers.

Mr. VENABLE. Was there any proof before the committee that the number is excessive?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. VENABLE. Has the committee any information to that effect?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think the number is excessive.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the committee has shown that they thought they were excessive, because since the fight I made on the bill last year, when there were 743 messengers, they have cut it down to 574 messengers in this bill. I think there are still about 500 too many now in the bill. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] intimated that they were employing them as clerks but calling them messengers to get them at lower salaries. If they are doing clerical duty, I maintain they ought to be paid clerks' salaries instead of messenger salaries, and our Government would then be treating them justly and fairly.

Mr. VENABLE. What the House is interested in is whether or not there are more employees than are needed.

Mr. BLANTON. They have cut off 169 since I made my fight last year.

Mr. VENABLE. We are dealing with those that are left in the bureau. What proof is there that the present number is excessive?

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will go down to the department to-morrow, he will find them clogging up the department, obstructing the corridors, many doing nothing but laughing and talking and smoking fine cigars.

Mr. VENABLE. How many does the gentleman claim should be reduced?

Mr. BLANTON. Strike 500 out of the bill. That still leaves 74.

Mr. VENABLE. Why does the gentleman place the number at 500?

Mr. BLANTON. I think there would then remain enough for one department. Seventy-four messengers, some drawing as high as \$1,000 per year, with a \$240 bonus added, ought to be enough for one department.

Mr. VENABLE. What do they do?

Mr. BLANTON. Carry messages, do errands, and nothing mostly.

Mr. VENABLE. Has the gentleman investigated it?

Mr. BLANTON. I spent a part of the month of August, all of September, and a part of October last in investigating this matter.

Mr. VENABLE. Of what did the gentleman's investigations consist?

Mr. BLANTON. I went through each department.

Mr. VENABLE. Walked through?

Mr. BLANTON. Walked through and looked through and asked questions and observed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph close in two minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want just to add this word in addition to what I have already said: These employees who are employed as messengers do all sorts of work besides messenger work. Sometimes they run mimeographing and other machines of one kind and another. They do all sorts of little things in the departments. They are very necessary; they earn their salaries. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] does not do himself credit when he proposes to abolish the places they now hold.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. I have learned, with a good deal of surprise, from the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that these \$600 messengers are smoking high-priced cigars. I hope the gentleman will use his influence with the bureau chiefs to suppress such terrible thriftlessness at a time like this, when we are all suffering from the high cost of living. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEVENSON. Oh, Senator Smoot's bill will cut that out.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of the best methods of road making, especially by the use of local materials; for studying the types of mechanical plants and appliances used for road building and maintenance; for studying methods of road repair and maintenance suited to the needs of different localities, and for furnishing expert advice on these subjects, \$77,300.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Why is the language stricken from the bill that called for clay, sand, and dirt roads? Are we to abandon all of those roads?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. The language was changed simply to make it conform more accurately to the character of the work that is being done. The studies that are now being made are more in the direction of investigations of methods of better utilization of road materials that exist in the vicinity of the roads. We are not abandoning the policy heretofore enforced with reference to sand and clay roads at all.

Mr. HAUGEN. Why should they not be included? Is it to be construed that the work is to be confined to hard-surfaced roads, and that clay and sand roads are to be abandoned?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, no; nothing in this bill would commit us to anything in respect to that.

Mr. HAUGEN. It would commit us to sand and clay roads if we included that language in the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Sand and clay roads are included in the general language anyway.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The Government of the United States does not build the roads.

Mr. HAUGEN. No; but it gives valuable advice.

Mr. MADDEN. The States build the roads, and I assume that the States will be able to get any advice they may ask for.

Mr. HAUGEN. The States are able to get any advice they desire as to any type of road, but why should we abandon those particular roads?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, let me say in answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] that the Federal Government has built a great many experimental roads.

Mr. MADDEN. I agree to that.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And it was proposed to discontinue it, but this bill as it is drawn would authorize that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I opposed it last year because so much road building was going on all over the country in every part of it that there ought to be opportunity enough for experimenting without having a large amount of money set aside for the express purpose of experimenting.

Mr. MADDEN. I agree with the gentleman that the Federal Government ought not to build any roads which it does not own and control itself.

Mr. HAUGEN. The language is—

For investigations of the best method of road making by the use of local material.

The bill of the current year includes the words "especially as to sand, clay, gravel," and so forth.

Mr. ANDERSON. We say here "by the use of local materials." What does that mean? It means sand, it means gravel, it means dirt, it means whatever local material there is in the place where the road is being built.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is, if you insert the language that was in there last year.

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. HAUGEN. As it stands now, it will be confined to cement and other materials.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is not a question of using anything. It is a matter of investigation.

Mr. HAUGEN. On the face of it, it will be construed that Congress has abandoned the soft-surface roads.

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. HAUGEN. And that we are committed to hard-surface roads. There is a vast difference of opinion about that.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Minnesota is wrong. I think this provides for experimenting materials.

Mr. ANDERSON. It says—

For investigations of the best methods of road making, especially by the use of local materials.

That is general language, and it includes all kinds of roads.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Those are investigations.

Mr. ANDERSON. Especially by the use of local materials, and that makes it certain that these investigations may extend into the use of sand and gravel and other local materials.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; with the permission of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I think there is no disposition on this side of the House to hasten afternoon adjournments. On this side of the House it is recognized that the appropriation bills are farther behind than they have been during the last 12 years. There is no disposition to try to delay them. We would be very glad to see them pass and become laws before the 4th of March.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Is not that condition due to the new rule which obtains with respect to appropriations?

Mr. GARRETT. I do not think so. I do not think it is due to the rule. I would inquire, if I may, of the gentleman from Minnesota if he knows whether it is the disposition of the majority side of the House to pass these bills before the 4th of March?

Mr. ANDERSON. It certainly is the intention to pass them before the 4th of March, so far as I know. I have endeavored



to make all the progress I could on this bill, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT. The situation is becoming such that it will probably be only a week before we will have to begin to work nights. Of course, the gentleman realizes, and the gentleman from Wyoming realizes quite as fully, that the trouble is going to come here on the conference reports. Now, it seems to me we might possibly arrange a program whereby these bills could get by or begin to work nights now.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is very well informed in regard to the House, but not entirely accurate in his statement in regard to the situation of appropriation bills. The fact is that if we carry out the program which we have in mind we shall pass the appropriation bills through the House this session more promptly than they have been passed in the last 20 years. As a matter of fact the appropriation bills are now at this moment as far advanced as they have been at any session for many years. However, the "gentleman from Wyoming" is exceedingly anxious to pass these bills and has been crowding them just as hard as it is possible to do. I have tried to get the House to meet at 11 o'clock. Gentlemen on both sides have objected to that, and I think with some reason. I have not insisted upon the early meeting, because I felt there was a good deal of reason for the objection that gentlemen offer. But unquestionably we shall very soon be required to meet earlier and possibly to sit a little later. I think we must all of us very soon make up our minds to remain here until about 6 o'clock, and I shall be very happy, indeed, if the House will, for a time at least, until we dispose of the appropriation bills, meet at 11. But I have deferred making the request for an early meeting, after having made it some days ago, until the committees could get a little further along with their hearings.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Why can we not agree now to work until 6 o'clock? Why should gentlemen object to working until 6 o'clock, instead of raising a point of order here and compelling us to adjourn?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. TILSON having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HICKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15812, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### CONSOLIDATION OF CUSTOMS COLLECTION DISTRICTS AND PORTS OF ENTRY (S. DOC. NO. 359).

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

The sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, contains the following provisions, viz:

The President is authorized from time to time, as the exigencies of the service may require, to rearrange, by consolidation or otherwise, the several customs collection districts and to continue ports of entry by abolishing the same or establishing others in their stead: *Provided*, That the whole number of customs collection districts, ports of entry, or either of them, shall at no time be made to exceed those now established and authorized except as the same may hereafter be provided by law: *Provided further*, That hereafter the collector of customs of each customs collection district shall be officially designated by the number of the district for which he is appointed and not by the name of the port where the headquarters are situated, and the President is authorized from time to time to change the location of the headquarters in any customs collection district as the needs of the service may require: *And provided further*, That the President shall, at the beginning of each regular session, submit to Congress a statement of all acts, if any, done hereunder and the reasons therefor.

Pursuant to the requirements of the third proviso to the said provision, I have to state that the following changes in the organization of the customs service have been made by Executive order:

By Executive order dated February 2, 1920, customs collection district No. 27 (southern California) was abolished and customs collection districts Nos. 25 (San Diego) and 27 (Los Angeles) were created.

By Executive order dated February 27, 1920, the county of Alexandria, Va., including the port of Alexandria, was transferred from customs collection district No. 13 (Maryland) to customs collection district No. 14 (Virginia).

By Executive order dated March 6, 1920, the port of Cedar Keys, customs collection district No. 18 (Florida), was abolished.

By Executive order dated September 1, 1920, the port of Sulzer, customs collection district No. 31 (Alaska), was abolished and a port of entry was created at Craig in the same collection district.

All of the above changes were dictated by considerations of economy and efficiency in the administration of customs and other statutes with the enforcement of which the customs service is charged, as well as the necessities and convenience of commerce generally.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

25 January, 1921.

#### PURCHASE OF GERMAN PLANES.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that House resolution 648, which is a privileged resolution, and a letter of the Postmaster General answering the questions asked in the resolution, be inserted in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the resolution and letter referred to be printed in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, what is the proposition?

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] introduced a resolution calling for information regarding some aeroplanes used in the Post Office Service—

Mr. WINGO. And this is the Postmaster General's answer to it?

Mr. KAHN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would like to ask the gentleman from California a question about another measure. What has become of the bill for the distribution of cannon and war supplies?

Mr. KAHN. I will say to the gentleman that I saw the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate two or three days ago, and urged him to call a conference in order that we might be able to agree on that measure with the least possible delay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The following is the resolution, with the correspondence in reply to the same:

#### House resolution 648.

*Resolved*, That the Postmaster General, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy each be requested to report to the House the number of German aeroplanes purchased by his department in 1920, the fund out of which payment for such planes was made, the authority for their purchase, the agency through which such planes were purchased, the price paid per plane, the use to which these planes have been put, the number of such planes destroyed by fire or otherwise, the number of pilots killed as the result of such destruction, the number of planes of American make in the possession of the respective departments, and the number in use.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,

Washington, D. C., January 24, 1921.

Hon. JULIUS KAHN,

Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On last Saturday, in response to an inquiry of Representative BLACK, I caused to be prepared a letter answering specifically the various inquiries set forth in House resolution 648, and I found a letter addressed to Mr. BLACK before me this morning for signature. It was signed and transmitted to him before your communication reached me. I attach hereto a copy of the letter addressed to Representative BLACK, which gives in detail the information requested by you.

Very respectfully, yours,

A. S. BURLISON.

JANUARY 24, 1921.

Hon. EUGENE BLACK,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLACK: Answering specifically your inquiry for information on the points set forth in the resolution by Representative MADDEN, asking the Postmaster General to report to the House:

1. The number of German planes purchased by his department in 1920.
2. The fund out of which payment for such planes was made.
3. The authority for their purchase.
4. The agency through which such planes were purchased.
5. The price paid per plane.
6. The use to which these planes have been put.
7. The number of planes destroyed by fire or otherwise.
8. The number of pilots killed as a result of such destruction.
9. The number of planes of American make in the possession of the Post Office Department, and the number in use.

I beg to advise as follows:

1. The Post Office Department purchased six Junker monoplanes, with enough spare parts to set up two additional planes, and in addition obtained spare parts to the value of two additional planes in order to keep the planes operating. This makes, delivered to the Post Office Department, eight planes in flying condition and spare parts to keep same in operation.

2. The payment for these planes was made out of the appropriation for aeroplane service between New York and San Francisco for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

3. The authority for such purchase is contained in the appropriation act for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921:

"For the purchase of such aeroplanes as may be necessary to establish, operate, and maintain an aeroplane service between New York, N. Y., and San Francisco, Calif." etc.

4. The planes were purchased by the Post Office Department direct from the J. L. Aircraft Corporation, 347 Madison Avenue, New York City.

5. The price paid for the eight planes and the necessary spare parts to keep them in operation was \$200,000, or \$20,000 per plane, plus \$40,000 for additional motors, wings, fuselage and plane parts.

6. These planes have been used in transporting mail between New York, Chicago, and Omaha on the New York-San Francisco route.

7. Two of these planes were destroyed by fire and one was destroyed by crashing into a tree after it had landed.

8. Two pilots and their mechanics were killed as the result of such destruction of these planes.

9. There are in the possession of the Post Office Department at this time 215 planes of American make, of which 65 are now in use, including those held as reserves at the various fields. The remainder of the 215 planes which had been allotted by the War and Navy Departments are either in warehouses or are being remodeled, to be drawn upon for carrying of the mails as the need for them develops.

The Junker airplanes purchased by the Post Office Department represent a forward step in airplane development over the development at that time in this country. Their operation over 30,122 miles gives 5.1 miles per gallon of fuel, as against an average of about 2.5 miles per gallon with the planes and motors in the Air Mail Service. The cost of flying operations with these planes is about 30 per cent less, and the cost of maintenance and upkeep about 50 per cent less than is the flying cost and maintenance cost of the Liberty motored De Haviland planes turned over to the Post Office Department by the Army and Navy.

On the other hand, the cruising radius of the Junker plane is at least 50 per cent more and the possible mail load is nearly two and one-half times as great as that of the surplus war planes with which the Air Mail is principally operated. Whether the relatively low cost of maintenance of a Junker plane over a De Haviland will continue as the planes see more service is something that is being determined by the daily operation of these planes by the side of the De Havilands.

When the German planes were put into service by the Post Office Department, after planes of this type had made a number of remarkable long-distance runs for other parties, defects in the fuel installation and in the engine compartment, ventilation, and drainage were discovered through planes catching fire in the air. These defects of construction and engineering were promptly remedied by the Post Office Department, since which time the planes have been operating steadily in the mail service without fire hazard or casualty of any character to the crews operating them. The safeguarding against fire hazard, as the result of the accidents to the Junker planes, has been of great importance to aviation and has resulted in the elimination of fire hazard in other mail ships.

Much has been said about the hazardous character of airplane flying in connection with carrying the mails. The total fatalities in more than two and one-half years of operation of the Air Mail Service, covering considerably more than 1,000,000 miles, have been at the rate of one for each 65,280 miles of flying. I am informed that the fatalities in civil aviation in Europe have been one for each 33,000 miles of flying. As the result of intensive daily operations of the Air Mail Service, flying in commercial work is being steadily made safer.

Sincerely, yours,

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE W. FITHIAN.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I sincerely regret to announce the death of a former Member of this House from my own State, the Hon. George W. Fithian, of Newton, Jasper County, Ill., who rendered distinctive and valuable service to his constituency and to the country during the Fifty-first, Fifty-second, and Fifty-third Congresses.

Mr. Fithian was a friend to all classes of people in all walks of life. He was held in the highest esteem and enjoyed the confidence and respect of all who knew him. In his demise Illinois has lost a distinguished son and Jasper County an honored and valued citizen.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

An act (S. 3944) to create a Federal live-stock commission, to define its powers and duties, and to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. ACKERMAN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for two days on account of important business.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, January 26, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

368. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of certain cards on file in the office of The Adjutant General of

the Army and requesting their disposition; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

369. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of expenditures on account of appropriation "Contingencies of the Army" during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GREENE of Vermont, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 636) requesting the War Department to furnish information to the Committee on Military Affairs regarding the abandonment of Camp Dodge and providing that pending the furnishing of such information and action thereon that no action toward the wrecking and abandonment of said camp be taken, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1227), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15876) to reorganize the Indian Service, to expedite the settlement of Indian affairs, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1228), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3516) to authorize the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to furnish quarters at Langley Field, Va., to the civilian employees of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1229), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MONTAGUE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14356) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Sanders Ferry, and between the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Elbert, Ga., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1230), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FIELDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15664) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish to the National Museum certain articles of the arms, material, equipment, or clothing heretofore issued or produced for the United States Army, and to dispose of colors, standards, and guidons of demobilized organizations of the United States Army, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1231), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DENISON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15750) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Little Calumet River in Cook County, State of Illinois, at or near the village of Burnham in said county, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1232), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14065) providing for the appraisal and sale of the Vashon Island Military Reservation in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1233), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 15892) to authorize the refunding of the national debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 15893) regulating the manner in which contracts for construction or repair of ships shall be made by the United States Shipping Board and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 15894) to authorize an appropriation to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to provide



medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for persons who served in the World War and are patients of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, Division of Rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 15895) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to make such repairs to hospitals and appurtenances as may be necessary; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 15896) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to continue and to enlarge the construction of the naval hospital at San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 458) restraining all further steps looking to allotment of lands within the Bad River Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin until further revision of the tribal roll; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 459) authorizing the President to extend invitations to foreign Governments to participate in a world's dairy congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring Federal aid for the building of public roads; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring Federal aid for the construction of roads; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, urging relief for settlers on Standing Rock Reservation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring the passage of the Fordney emergency tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring the passage of the Fordney adjusted compensation bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging an appropriation to aid in the building of public roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging additional appropriations for the improvement of public highways; to the Committee on Roads.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 15897) granting a pension to Ida A. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15898) for the relief of the Post Publishing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 15899) granting a pension to Phoebe Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5235. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of Captain Walter M. Gearty Post No. 315 American Legion, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring fourfold adjusted compensation, the Stevenson bill, and bills and resolutions for adequate hospitalization of disabled veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5236. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of sundry citizens of La Crosse, Wis., protesting against the Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5237. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Illinois State Horticultural Society, protesting against the passage of House bill 12466; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

5238. Also, petition of the Kendall County (Ill.) Farm Bureau Association, favoring the French-Capper truth in fabric bill (H. R. 11641, S. 3689); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5239. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Thomas H. Kearney, Thomas F. Mackey, and Israel H. Farnham, of the National Association of United States Customs Inspectors, favoring House bill 15089 and Senate bill 4693; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5240. Also, petition of William H. O'Brien, 21 Linden Street, South Boston; Charles McMorro, 187 Dorchester Street, South Boston; and Francis X. Daly, care of Boston College, Chestnut Hill, all in the State of Massachusetts, in opposition to Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5241. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of International Association of Machinists, Cleveland Lodge, No. 439, favoring unrestricted resumption of trade and travel privileges with soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5242. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Resolution of the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., requesting Congress to assume control of the coal industry; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

5243. Also, resolution by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., recommending to Congress the speedy enactment of Representative KELLEY's bill providing that the deposits in the United States postal savings banks be used to finance home building at a minimum rate of interest, and that Congress enact a law prohibiting speculation in building material; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5244. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Local No. 390, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, protesting against the demotion of special clerks in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

5245. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, urging the enactment of House bill 15622; to the Committee on Patents.

5246. Also, petition of Confectioners and Ice Cream Manufacturers' Protective Association of the State of New York, favoring a revision of the war revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5247. Also, petition of the American Asiatic Association, New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 7204; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5248. Also, petition of Women's Roosevelt Memorial Association, of New York City, favoring Senate bill 3774; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

5249. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the Adlephian Club, of Alameda, Calif., protesting against commercializing our national parks and monuments; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

5250. Also, petition of John B. Miller, president of the Southern California Edison Co., of Los Angeles, Calif., relative to water-power development in the national parks; to the Committee on Water Power.

5251. Also, petition of California Real Estate Association, of Oakland, Calif., relative to the conservation of water resources in the Colorado River basin; to the Committee on Water Power.

5252. Also, petition of California Real Estate Association, of Oakland, Calif., relative to the housing shortage now existing in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5253. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging the passage of the Johnson bill restricting immigration to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5254. Also, petition of Seth Mann, president of the Pacific Coast Traffic League, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 4524, to amend section 4 of the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5255. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Stephen S. Day, of Sacramento, Calif., urging protection of the olive industry of this country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5256. Also, petition of J. B. McGinty, of Santa Cruz, Calif., urging a protective tariff for poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5257. Also, petition of Charles E. Clinch, of Grass Valley, Calif., protesting against the 1 per cent tax on sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5258. Also, petition of Los Angeles Ice & Cold Storage Co., protesting against the continuance of the tax now levied against soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5259. Also, petition of California Fruit Growers' Exchange, of Los Angeles, Calif., urging a reduction in county, State, and national taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5260. Also, petition of Mayer & Weinschenk, wholesale jewelers, and M. Schussler & Co., of San Francisco, Calif., favoring a gross sales tax for all industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5261. By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of certain residents and taxpayers of the borough of Roosevelt, N. J., protesting against the passage of the Kenyon-Anderson bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5262. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of the Friday Afternoon Club, of California, Pa., in support of the Sheppard-Towner bill (H. R. 10925); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5263. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of sundry citizens of Buncombe and Jackson Counties, N. C., and the Kiwanis Club of

Asheville, N. C., relating to aid for the suffering Chinese and other European peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5264. Also, petition of the Kiwanis Club of Asheville, N. C., favoring the upbuilding of our institutions of learning and also favoring Federal aid in the construction of public highways; to the Committee on Roads.

5265. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of Montgomery County Farm Bureau, Norristown, Pa., opposing any change in the standard time of the country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5266. By Mr. YATES: Petition of B. H. of P. E. O., by Miss Isabella M. Honeur, of Sterling, Ill., writes urging the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5267. Also, petition of C. J. Sell, of Joliet, Ill., favoring the Fess-Capper bill and also urging the appropriation of certain funds for the enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on Education.

5268. Also, petition of Chicago Building Material Exchange, by Mr. Lemuel F. Owen, business manager, protesting against the restricting or prohibiting of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5269. Also, petitions of the Dry Dock Association of New York and the Atlantic Coast Shipbuilders' Association of New York, both by Henry C. Hunter, secretary, and the National Bottle Manufacturers' Association of the United States and Canada, favoring the passage of House bill 13591; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5270. Also, petition of Bethany Church of the Brethren, Chicago, favoring the Fess-Capper bill; to the Committee on Education.

5271. Also, petition of Danville Trades and Labor Council, urging the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5272. Also, petition of National Malleable Castings Co., of East St. Louis, Ill., the same company, Chicago office; and J. M. Sellers, president Sellers Manufacturing Co., Chicago, favoring House bill 1551 or an adequate substitute directing the Treasury Department to honor Interstate Commerce Commission certificates for partial payments to railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5273. Also, petition of A. F. Franks Cigar Co., East St. Louis, Ill., protesting against an increase in tariff on imported tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5274. Also, petition of the Review, H. C. Schaub, editor, Decatur, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 15327; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5275. Also, petition of F. H. Noble & Co., Chicago, urging the taxation of bulk sales rather than the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5276. Also, petition of Illinois Bankers' Association, Chicago, Ill., urging an appropriation for Federal aid work in cooperation with the States; to the Committee on Roads.

5277. Also, petition of Charles T. Flofa, adjutant George Hart Post, No. 167, American Legion, Harrisburg, Ill., recommending a certain educational bonus for the ex-soldiers, ex-sailors, and ex-marines of the late war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 26, 1921.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., the Chaplain, offered the following prayer:

Praise and thanksgiving become us, Our Father, when we approach Thy throne of grace with due reliance of dependence upon Thee, and beseech Thee to help us constantly, lest we forget our responsibilities. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gooding	McLean	Smith, Md.
Ball	Hale	McNary	Smoot
Borah	Harrison	Nelson	Sterling
Calder	Heflin	Owen	Sutherland
Capper	Henderson	Page	Swanson
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Penrose	Trammell
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Underwood
Dial	Kendrick	Robinson	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	Keyes	Sherman	Willis
Fletcher	McKellar	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. McNARY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] are detained on official business.

Mr. HARRISON. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The reading clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. JONES of New Mexico and Mr. POINDexter answered to their names when called.

Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. GRONNA, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ELKINS, Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. STANLEY, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. KING, Mr. WARREN, Mr. TOWNSEND, Mr. BECKHAM, and Mr. THOMAS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

### COMMERCE WITH RUSSIA (S. DOC. NO. 365).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of Commerce submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$50,000 required by the Department of Commerce to further promote and develop commerce with Russia during the fiscal year 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

### FUEL FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 364).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$19,435.52 required for miscellaneous expenses of the Department of Agriculture to meet the increased cost of fuel, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

### CLAIMS DUE BY COMMISSIONER OF LIGHTHOUSES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, a communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce reporting claims which have been considered, adjusted, and determined to be due the claimants by the Commissioner of Lighthouses, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

### COMPENSATION OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the fixing of a particular day upon which a vote may be had on House bill 5726, known as the minimum wage bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. May I inquire if the Senator objects to fixing any specific time?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I wish to give notice to the Senate that at the conclusion of the morning hour to-day I shall move to set aside temporarily the particular bill which is the unfinished business and proceed to the consideration of House bill 5726.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to give notice that I shall insist on proceeding under Rule VIII, so that we can dispose of the measure which was before the Senate yesterday morning, and thereafter take up the other measures on the calendar.

Mr. BORAH. I understood the Senator from California to give notice that his motion would be made after the conclusion of the routine morning business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; after the morning hour to-day.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then I misunderstood the Senator. I thought his notice was that he would make the motion at the conclusion of the morning business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am going to make a similar motion each day, too, I might advise the Senator from Georgia, in relation to this particular bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I thank the Senator for the information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Petitions and memorials are in order.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARREN. I send to the desk a telegram from the members of the Legislature of Wyoming and ask that it be spread upon the RECORD under the rule and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.